SEP 10 1982 1045-B Y 4. P96/10: 97-H55

SMALL WATERSHED PROJECTS OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

COMPLETED
140

ORIGINAL

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

UPPER MUD RIVER, W. VA.; LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, ILL.;
MOZINGO CREEK, MO.; SOUTH ZUMBRO RIVER, MINN.

JUNE 11, 1982

SERIAL NO. 97-H55

Printed for the use of the Committee on Environment and Public Works

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
96-944 O WASHINGTON: 1982

I

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont, *Chairman*

HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr., Tennessee
PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
JOHN H. CHAFEE, Rhode Island
ALAN K. SIMPSON, Wyoming
JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota
STEVE SYMMS, Idaho
SLADE GORTON, Washington
FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, Alaska

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota
GARY HART, Colorado
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, New York
GEORGE J. MITCHELL, Maine
MAX BAUCUS, Montana

Bailey Guard, *Staff Director*
John W. Yago, Jr., *Minority Staff Director*

Subcommittee on Water Resources

JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota, *Chairman*

PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
SLADE GORTON, Washington
FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, Alaska

DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, New York
LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas
MAX BAUCUS, Montana

CONTENTS

OPENING STATEMENTS

Page
Abdnor, Hon. James, U.S. Senator from the State of South Dakota 1
Randolph, Hon. Jennings, U.S. Senator from the State of West Virginia 2

WITNESSES

Byrd, Hon. Robert C., U.S. Senator from the State of West Virginia 3
Clayton, Ralph, chairman, Nodaway Soil and Water Conservation District 20
Prepared statement 61
Crowell, John B., Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Agriculture, accompanied by Peter Myers, Chief, Soil Conservation Service; and Joseph W. Haas, Deputy Chief for Natural Resource Projects, Soil Conservation Service 28
Prepared statements 78, 81
Responses to written questions 91
Durenberger, Hon. Dave, and Hon. Rudy Boschwitz, U.S. Senators from the State of Minnesota 23, 24
Prepared statements 65
Eagleton, Hon. Thomas F., and Hon. John C. Danforth, U.S. Senators from the State of Missouri 18, 19
Prepared statements 53, 55
Erdahl, Hon. Arlen, a Representative in Congress from the State of Minneota. 25
Hagedorn, Hon. Tom, a Representative in Congress from the State of Minnesota 9
Prepared statement 38
Howell, Ed, chairman, Little Calumet Steering Commission 17
Prepared statement 51
Kudrna, Frank, director, Division of Water Resources, State of Illinois 15
Prepared statement 43
Larzo, Raymond Ernest, administrative assistant, Boone County Commission .. 6
Keith, Hon. Lester, mayor, City of Maryville 20
Prepared statement 58
Monday, Hon. C. E., mayor, Hamlin, W. Va 5
Melas, Nicholas, president, Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. 16
Prepared statement 48
Osann, Ed, director, National Wildlife Federation Water Resources Program, accompanied by Reed Harvey 35
Prepared statement 119
Percy, Hon. Charles, and Hon. Alan Dixon, U.S. Senators from the State of Illinois 12, 14
Sitzman, Father Alphonse, cochairman, Nodaway County Mozingo Committee. 21
Prepared statement 63
Sloane, Denver, member, Lincoln County Watershed Board 6
Strain, Darrell, and Peter Solinger, council members, city of Rochester, Minn 26, 27
Prepared statement 73
Watkins, Mark R., cochairman, Nodaway County Mozingo Committee 19
Prepared statement 56

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Page
Agriculture, Department of, letter to Senator Stafford 115
Statements:
  Baucus, Hon. Max, U.S. Senator from the State of Montana 11
  Giglio, Hon. Frank, representative, Illinois House of Representatives 123
  Olmstead County, Minn 76
  Mozingo Creek, statements relative to 125-136
  Upper Mud River Watershed Association 122

SMALL WATERSHED PROJECTS OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1982

U. S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 9:05 a.m., in room 4200, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. James Abdnor (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Abdnor and Randolph.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ABDNOR, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Senator ABDNOR. The Subcommittee on Water Resources will come to order.

We are pleased that we have such a strong interest, in our hearing this morning, at which we will discuss the merits of four Soil Conservation Service projects. Specifically, these projects are the Upper Mud River in West Virginia, the Little Calumet River in Illinois, Mozingo Creek in Missouri, and the South Zumbro River in Minnesota.

I note the significance of this hearing. It has been more than 3 years since the Subcommittee on Water Resources last held a hearing on Public Law 566 on small watershed projects. These are the first such projects to be submitted to Congress in that period, and the Department of Agriculture is to be commended for reviving this important program.

These projects, I should explain, do not go to the Senate floor to be authorized. They will become officially authorized when resolutions are adopted by the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate. So, the responsibility of this committee for a thorough study of these projects is a particularly heavy one. It would be my hope that our subcommittee will be able to consider these projects in a markup after we have reviewed the record fully in a few weeks. For that purpose, the committee will keep the hearing record open for 2 weeks, allowing additional time for statements that may be submitted.

We shall also include in the hearing record answers to a number of questions provided to me by the Soil Conservation Service, as well as other material, including letters written to the subcommittee regarding several of these projects. I will be submitting questions for the record that I hope will be answered by Secretary Crowell within the next 2 weeks.

We are pleased to welcome as witnesses several of our Senate colleagues as well as several of my former colleagues in the House. First, I certainly want to call on a gentleman that chaired this committee for so many years, the dean of the committee, Senator Randolph.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Senator **Randolph**. Thank you very much, Chairman Abdnor.

I wish to commend you on the grasp of the matters that come before the Subcommittee on Water Resources. It has been very comforting, and we of the committee are very grateful for your leadership.

I join with you in welcoming our witnesses. As you have indicated, this is the first hearing in several years on Soil Conservation Service projects developed under the watershed protection and flood prevention program. One of the projects that you have mentioned being considered today is of importance to West Virginia and our citizenry. I am grateful that my capable colleague, Senator Byrd, will present testimony, and I shall give to him the opportunity of introducing those citizens of West Virginia who accompany him. They are intensely interested and knowledgeable in these matters.

We think especially of the Upper Mud River in Lincoln and Boone Counties in West Virginia, a 61,600 acre watershed, and there have been very severe flooding problems. Particular damage has occurred in Hamlin, the county seat of Lincoln County, and in the surrounding areas, very rural and very agricultural, yet very important.

Citizens there have been working since 1969 to seek assistance from the Soil Conservation Service in developing a project to alleviate and mitigate the problems that even now continue. Planning for the project began 7 years ago—1975. The watershed work plan has, as its principal measure, soil conservation practices on local farms and structural measures. These include one floodwater-retarding dam and one multipurpose reservoir for flood protection and recreation. This project, estimated to cost $7.1 million, will be financed by the Federal Government and the local sponsors. Annual benefits are $488,000, resulting in a positive—repeating positive—cost-benefit ratio.

Residents of Lincoln and Boone Counties are here with Senator Byrd to testify. I know that this will be a productive hearing, as you have indicated. I think often of the new members that have come to our committee, and I thank you very much for scheduling this meeting after the work plans were finally forwarded to the Congress by the administration.

Thank you very much.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you, Senator Randolph. I would like to say that I have a long way to go and a lot of learning to do. You have been a great leader.

I know Senator Byrd needs to catch a plane and we want to let him go ahead as quickly as possible. I just want to say we welcome you to the committee and I know you want to introduce the witnesses you have with you. We are looking forward to hearing from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT C. BYRD, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA, ACCOMPANIED BY HON. C. E. MONDAY, MAYOR, HAMLIN, W. VA.; DENVER SLOANE, MEMBER, LINCOLN COUNTY WATERSHED BOARD; AND RAYMOND ERNEST LARZO, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT, BOONE COUNTY COMMISSION

Senator BYRD. Mr. Chairman and Senator Randolph, I most appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for convening the committee early at my request in order that I might, as you have already indicated, board a plane for West Virginia.

I appreciate the presence of my senior colleague on the committee, who also came early to accommodate my leaving. And I am grateful on behalf of my constituents who will be testifying after I leave for the courtesies that are being extended to them.

Before I begin my own prepared statement, I would like to present to the committee, Mr. Chairman and Senator Randolph, Mr. C. E. Monday, who is mayor of Hamlin. He sits on my right. Now, Wylie Stowers, who is the county chairman, Senator Randolph, as you and I know, could not attend because of the illness of his father. Wylie had intended to attend.

Coming with Mayor Monday is Mr. Denver Sloane. Mr. Denver Sloane sits to my immediate left. He is a member of the Lincoln County Watershed Board. Then to Mr. Sloane's left is Raymond Ernest Larzo, who is administrative assistant to the Boone County Commission, and he comes from Madison.

So, going from my right to my left are, in this order: Mr. C. E. Monday, mayor of Hamlin in Lincoln County; Mr. Denver Sloane, member of the Lincoln County Watershed Board; and Mr. Raymond Ernest Larzo, administrative assistant to the Boone County Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to speak in support of the upper Mud River watershed project which would provide flood protection benefits for Lincoln, Boone, and Cabell Counties in West Virginia. The upper Mud River watershed project could protect local crops, roads, and bridges, and residential and commercial properties by an average annual flood reduction amount of $92,000. In addition, according to projected figures provided by the Soil Conservation Service, the only recreational benefits provided to the three-county area by a created lake would amount to $213,300.

Now let's take the city of Hamlin, for example, of which Mr. Monday is the mayor. That city has been hard hit by vast flooding. The upper Mud River watershed project's multipurpose dam would provide substantial protection for 100,000 acres of agricultural land, 83 homes, 18 commercial establishments, one church, four garages, and 17 farm buildings in that community alone. In Milton and Barboursville, cities of Cabell County, the project would provide protection for 280 homes, several churches, and roads. In addition, recreational side benefits for all three counties would be substantial, adding to the economy through the promotion of tourism as well as increasing advantages for local residents.

The upper Mud River watershed project would cost $7,285,000. This project has been in the planning and review stage since 1975. It was first approved by the Secretary of Agriculture only in the summer of 1979, and it was referred to the Water Resources Council for review in November 1979. Following considerably delay at that level, we were able to include Federal financing for the project in the agricultural, rural Development, and related agencies appropriations bill of 1981. We were also able to exempt several portions of the upper Mud River watershed project from the Presidential directive mandating independent review by the Council, a function for which the Council had not been empowered.

After the need for independent review by the Water Resources Council was eliminated, the plan was sent to the Office of Management and Budget, and there the plan remained under review until this spring, when at long last it was sent to the appropriate committees of Congress for authorization.

So we have before us today a chance to give much needed help to the people of Lincoln, Boone, and Cabell Counties of West Virginia. Those people have worked long and hard on this project planning and on efforts to provide for its installation. The proposed watershed enjoys very strong local support, and that support was shown by a willingness at the local level to assume over $3.1 million for the cost of its implementation. The day-to-day anxiety and the suffering that could be removed from the lives of those that this project would protect is incalculable, and we can end that anxiety and suffering at a relatively minor Federal cost.

My Appropriations Committee, as I have already indicated, has appropriated money for several watershed projects throughout the country and has also waived the action of the previously required action by the Water Resources Council, which has remained a rather defunct entity, so that these projects could be moved ahead. So I would urge my colleagues to take favorable action on the upper Mud River watershed project and to report it to the full committee for action within the near future.

Again, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your kindness in accommodating me with this early meeting, and I thank my senior colleague for his appearance here at this early hour. I thank our friends from West Virginia who will testify and I have confidence that this subcommittee will, after a careful study of the facts, act favorably on the request.

Senator **ABDNOR**. Thank you, Mr. Leader. That is a very excellent statement. I am sure the other witnesses will add additional material. We appreciate having you here this morning and we hope we haven't caused you to miss your plane.

Senator **BYRD**. Not at all, you have helped me. Thank you very much.

Senator **RANDOLPH**. Mr. Chairman, I add only this word for the record, that we are grateful for the attention given to this project by Senator Byrd and for his leadership in helping us to arrange this important hearing this morning. And if he has just 1 minute I have a few questions for those gentlemen who are here from the State. Senator Byrd, you have mentioned Cabell County, in our formal project that is not included. Would you wish to make any comments on Cabell County? We realize the down river picture, and I want to have that clearly understood, that there are benefits to Cabell County, which I think is true. Maybe someone else can better respond.

Senator **Byrd**. Flood prevention, of course, would be better in Lincoln and Boone, but Cabell County is downstream and it too, according to the Soil Conservation Service, would reap some benefits from this project.

Senator **Randolph**. So you are looking on it as three counties rather than two, and I endorse that thought and explanation.

Senator **Abdnor**. What is the other county?

Senator **Randolph**. Cabell, C-a-b-e-l-l. And that is a very large county in our State from the standpoint of industry, business, and agriculture.

Senator **Byrd**. And it has the largest city in the State.

Senator **Randolph**. Yes, Huntington. And I just wanted the record to show Cabell is included, as you have indicated, for reasons of being downstream, and certainly the benefits would accrue there as well as in Lincoln and Boone.

Senator **Byrd**. Yes.

Senator **Randolph**. Thank you.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you.

Senator **Byrd**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It has been a pleasure. I hope you have a wonderful trip to West Virginia, the State that is "Almost Heaven."

Senator **Abdnor**. I am looking forward to it.

Mr. Mayor, would you care to add a statement? We have quite a list of witnesses. I can assure you if you have a prepared statement it will be included in the record if you care to submit it. You go right ahead, but we would remind the witnesses that we do have to be brief to get through the great number of witnesses.

STATEMENT OF HON. C. E. MONDAY

Mayor **Monday**. Mr. Chairman, Senator Randolph, I have been living in this community some 50 years where we proposed this watershed reservoir. I have seen the water, several times in my life, overflow this town, not only the town itself but a lot of farmland. Just last week we had a downpour of about 3½ inches, and I would say I looked over the crops this last week downriver and there was at least $50,000 in damage to tobacco.

In 1974 the people in the county got together and voted in a levee to support the watershed association. Right now with the help of the State road commission, which usually comes in and helps build the roads, we have close to $2 million available with the help of the State road commission and Boone County, which has pledged $500,000, and Lincoln County is close to $500,000. We already have this in this project.

You were talking about Milton, and it hasn't been too long ago when there would be a flood down in Cabell and you would have water going through windows, new homes, old ones as well.

Not only will this probably take a lot of people out of poverty, which Lincoln County is hardest hit in the State—about 15 percent unemployment—it would create some work for a lot of people. Any time you put a 300-acre lake into this economy, into this area, you are going to create a lot of recreation. This county lies between the most thickly populated places in the State—Logan, Boone, and Cabell Counties. And Lincoln County is right in the center of it.

In 1939 I remember we had a great flood there, one of the worst we ever had. In 1973 we had a damaging flood, 1978 we had a damaging flood. It is getting so I don't know whether it is the terrain or the river is filling up, but it is getting so we have lots and lots of problems with the water. We have come up with the idea that we probably could take a lot of people off welfare, a lot of people out of work now, if we could get this recreation project in. Plus if something happens to the water resources we have in Hamlin today where we get our supply of water, Muddy River goes dry in the summertime lots of times, if something happens to our well water we would have no place to get water to drink even for this small town. We have about 1,200 population.

Senator **Abdnor**. That is 1,200?

Mayor **Monday**. In the town.

I have been serving this community. If I serve this term as mayor it will be 21 years of serving the community as either on the council or mayor. I know a lot that could be corrected if we could get this dam put in. A lot of our problems could be solved.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you.

Mr. Sloane, do you have a statement?

STATEMENT OF DENVER SLOANE

Mr. **Sloane**. I am a newly appointed district supervisor in Lincoln County, and this is kind of new to me. But I have been born and raised right in this neighborhood. One farmer down there in Lincoln County, had lost around 50 acres of corn and 5½ acres of tobacco on just on one farm, and this is the better farming section of Lincoln County. There are frequent overflows. We are losing crops. Two and three times each year crops have been lost before we can get it because of overflow floods.

That is about all I have to say.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you.

Mr. Larzo, do you have a statement? Don't feel like you have to.

STATEMENT OF RAYMOND ERNEST LARZO

Mr. **Larzo**. Mr. Chairman, Senator, I would just like to express to you the interest of the Boone County Commission in this project. They are very interested and they are willing to contribute funds toward this project. As Mr. Monday had mentioned, $500,000 has been more or less pledged, and if funds are available they will consider even more.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you.

Do you want to go ahead?

Senator **Randolph**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is not the problem of authorization of a project like this. This is a very important project. I think there are now about 162 projects, Mr. Chairman, that have been authorized. It is the funding for these projects that is the difficult part of the process here on

Capitol Hill. The presence and leadership of Senator Byrd on the Appropriations Committee can be and will be very helpful to you.

I want to just ask you, Mayor Monday, how did the name become Mud River?

Mayor **Monday**. Because it is always muddy; it is never clear. That is why it got its name. Any time you have a rainfall you have mud.

Senator **Randolph**. Well, we have that in the Potomac River.

Mayor **Monday**. Yes, but that is where it is supposed to have gotten its name.

Senator **Randolph**. This further question. You have said it and Senator Byrd as well said it, that problems are going to be alleviated, as Mr. Sloane has also indicated. What are those problems that will actually be alleviated by the completion of this watershed work plan?

Mayor **Monday**. Well, the problem would certainly be the homes that would be saved from damage.

Senator **Randolph**. I see. Protection for homes.

Mayor **Monday**. Protection for homes, and especially for the farmers.

Senator **Randolph**. You mean the crops?

Mayor **Monday**. Yes.

Senator **Randolph**. What are the crops there?

Mayor **Monday**. Well, tobacco, mostly tobacco, because Lincoln County is the largest tobacco-producing county in West Virginia, and that is where most of the farmers derive their money from.

Senator **Randolph**. Are there sheds to where the tobacco is taken?

Mayor **Monday**. Yes.

Senator **Randolph**. They exist in Lincoln County?

Mayor **Monday**. Yes, sir.

Senator **Randolph**. And they are subject to flooding; is that what you are saying?

Mayor **Monday**. That is right. A lot of these lowlands where they have tobacco crops, when water gets over the tobacco, it ruins it. You either have to reset if you have time or forget it that year. When a farmer relies on the tobacco crops, it hurts when he can't get it planted back.

Senator **Randolph**. Mr. Chairman, it is very proper that the emphasis be placed on the economic benefits. But also there are recreational aspects in a project of the type we are considering here in West Virginia. What would be the value from the standpoint of recreation for the residents of these three counties—Lincoln, Boone, and Cabell?

Mayor **Monday**. Like I say, it is right in the center of these three counties. Huntington is probably 30 miles away. Charleston is probably 25 miles. Boone County, which Madison is the county seat, is 15 miles. Logan is probably 20 miles from this area. If you go over to East Lynn Dam and see the people using the recreation facilities there every weekend and holidays, I am sure we could have a lot of those coming to Lincoln County. Any time you put traffic on the road, you are going to sell more gasoline, you are going to serve more hotdogs, and you are going to have more people working on the roads.

Senator **RANDOLPH**. Who can speak affirmatively and accurately on the size of a lake of this size?

Mayor **MONDAY**. The lake itself?

Senator **RANDOLPH**. Yes.

Mayor **MONDAY**. 310 acres at low level.

Senator **RANDOLPH**. Will there be fish there?

Mayor **MONDAY**. Oh, yes, boat docks, fish.

Senator **RANDOLPH**. Swimming?

Mayor **MONDAY**. Hopefully yes.

Senator **RANDOLPH**. No motorboats would be allowed?

Mayor **MONDAY**. That is the plan.

Senator **RANDOLPH**. Sailboats?

Mayor **MONDAY**. Sailboats and rowboats.

Senator **RANDOLPH**. I think the recreational features sometimes are overlooked in the presentation of a case on a watershed project. As we know, the time of a sinister connotation, the word "dam" we removed that a long time ago. The Corps of Engineers calls every project in West Virginia a lake. There is a dam and maybe a reservoir, but it is a lake, and that is what we must continue to talk about, not just talk about a dam. When you speak of a dam, people sort of recoil. The benefits from a lake, a project of this kind, which we must not overlook, which are, of course, economic, recreational and the strengthening of the general well being of the people.

Mayor **MONDAY**. We have no industry whatsoever in the county.

Senator **RANDOLPH**. Speaking of the project, this is not a small amount of water, you have indicated. What would that be?

Mayor **MONDAY**. I understand it is close to 26 miles of shoreline.

Senator **RANDOLPH**. Mayor, in this type of project, I join all of you. West Virginia has not a single lake. We have, however, a State that is the mother of rivers, and in West Virginia over a period of years we have been able to bring into being an R. D. Bailey Lake, a Burnsville Lake, many, many lakes in West Virginia, and they have helped not only the economy and the protection of property and lives, but they have given to West Virginia the impetus that makes tourism the second largest industry in our State; isn't that correct?

Mayor **MONDAY**. Right.

Senator **RANDOLPH**. And so there is a value here, as a value in every State, and I want to emphasize that at a hearing of this kind.

Senator **ABDNOR**. Thank you. I know what tourism means. It is No. 2 in my State.

Just to emphasize what Senator Randolph says, we have 162 projects that are authorized and not started and 442 under construction. I wish I was here in the days it was easier to find the dollars for these programs. But we are going to do the best we can as we look these programs over.

We thank you for being here so bright and early in the morning, and we will see how it goes when the time comes for the committee action. Thank you very much.

Senator **RANDOLPH**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Only I wish to say, Senator Byrd on the Appropriations Committee, a hearing of this kind spelling out the facts, and your attention, Mr. Chairman, to these matters as the new leader of our Subcommittee on Water Resources, we can not only authorize, that is a very necessary process, but we need to go and secure the money for these projects. And already the people of these counties have pledged money. Is that right?

Mayor **Monday**. Yes, sir. Since 1974 we voted ours in.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you very much.

I see we have Congressman Hagedorn here. We really do want to keep the continuity. We welcome you.

STATEMENT OF HON. TOM HAGEDORN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Representative **Hagedorn**. Thank you. I appreciate this opportunity to testify before your distinguished panel in support of the South Fork Zumbro River flood control project in Rochester, Minn.

At the outset, let me say what a pleasure it is to see you again, Jim.

Senator **Abdnor**. Nice to have you here.

Representative **Hagedorn**. You are certainly missed on our Public Works Committee, where you served with distinction for a long time, and we wish you well in your new capacity in the majority in the Senate.

Senator **Abdnor**. It is usually easier to get more House Members on the committee at 9 o'clock in the morning than on this side.

Representative **Hagedorn**. I am not so sure.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend a special welcome to a couple of fellow southern Minnesotans who are here to testify on behalf of the Rochester project as well. Darrell Strain and Peter Solinger, both council members from Rochester and both members of the city flood control commission, are here and will testify later. I know you will join me in welcoming them, Mr. Chairman.

At this point I am going to deviate from my prepared statement.

The Rochester flood control project is critical, Mr. Chairman, and could save hundreds of millions of dollars in property damage when completed. Although this hearing is focusing on the SCS projects, the SCS and corps projects are linked to form the basis for flood control in the watershed area. This week the House Public Works Committee heard testimony from the Corps of Engineers, who recommended funding for this important project. As a member of the authorizing committee in the House for the SCS and corps segments, I urge you to support this project.

In the interest of time and the large number of witnesses waiting, I will relinquish the balance of my time and thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you. It is good to have you over here. Your endorsement to a project means a lot. Your entire statement will be made a part of the record. We are looking forward to hearing the Senators and excellent witnesses. I don't mind telling you I have talked about this project on many occasions. Senator Durenberger has been here before and some of your witnesses have been in our office and gone through the project. We know it is an important project.

Representative **Hagedorn**. I might add, Mr. Chairman, this flood control project is part of a new congressional district, which I hope to be able to serve next year, but more importantly, a project that I have been involved and interested in as a member of the Public Works Committee for the last 8 years and have been a longtime supporter. This isn't a new interest I have taken in this project because I have supported it in the Public Works Committee over in the House for several years, to assist this important project and bring about its ultimate funding and successful construction and completion.

Senator **Abdnor**. The only thing I can add to that, you have a lot of interest in other projects for the water development of the country. When you start talking about all the projects that are authorized we better show some interest so the ones needed get the proper attention.

I know you have to go. Thank you very much.

Representative **Hagedorn**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator **Abdnor**. Without objection, I am going to place a statement in the record by Senator Max Baucus.

[The statement referred to follows:]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAX BAUCUS

Subcommittee on Water Resources, Environment and Public Works Committee
June 11, 1982

Mr. Chairman, I commend you for calling today's hearing to review possible authorizations for a number of small watershed projects as administered by the Soil Conservation Service. The witnesses who are scheduled to testify, both our colleagues from the House and Senate and others from around the country, bring important and helpful expertise on this subject to the hearing.

In reviewing information submitted by the SCS prior to this hearing, I was interested to note that virtually every state has P.L. 566 projects underway or awaiting the green light for construction. This is not a "make-work" program, either. These projects result in immediate and significant local benefits. This fact is demonstrated by the local participation in financing.

Unfortunately, the Soil Conservation Service has been caught in the squeeze between shrinking federal involvement and ever increasing demands for construction. This situation requires careful consideration and screening of each project to insure the greatest return in flood prevention and water management benefits.

I am confident that the projects which we will consider today do demonstrate benefits of this nature. However, this is just the tip of the iceberg. The SCS has identified a number of other projects around the country which can and should be considered for new starts.

One such project is on Wolf Creek in Fergus County, Montana. The project is modest in cost but would produce immediate flood prevention results in and around the town of Denton. If allowed to go forward, the plan calls for the construction of a system of dikes along the banks of Wolf Creek to insure that it continues on its way to the Missouri River without making a detour into town!

I look forward to reviewing the record which is developed at today's hearing. In addition, I would request the opportunity to submit questions for written response by our witnesses.

Thank you.

Senator **Abdnor**. We will be in recess for a few minutes.

[Brief recess.]

Senator **Abdnor**. The committee will come to order.

We are happy to have with us Senator Percy and Senator Dixon, outstanding Senators from Illinois. I know, Senator Percy, although you have some other problems on the Foreign Relations Committee and all the problems we have going on in the Nation, you never forget your constituents.

STATEMENTS OF HON. CHARLES PERCY, AND HON. ALAN DIXON, U.S. SENATORS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, ACCOMPANIED BY FRANK KUDRNA, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES, STATE OF ILLINOIS; NICHOLAS MELAS, PRESIDENT, METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO; AND ED HOWELL, CHAIRMAN, LITTLE CALUMET STEERING COMMISSION

Senator **Percy**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I want to express my appreciation particularly on behalf of the very large Lebanese population, some 35,000, that live in Peoria, Ill., alone, for the deep concern you have had for the people of Lebanon, the problems of the Middle East and the devotion you have provided day after day in watching this crisis unfold.

We do turn our attention to another from of tragedy, not loss of life but tremendous loss of property. The worst thing that can happen to us is to have something happen to our own homes. I have sat in the middle of flooded basements just looking at films I had had that I had taken through the years that were damaged by water, the walls, floor covering elsewhere covered by water, and I really know what it is like. It has happened twice in my lifetime in my own home. So when it happens again in an area just south of Chicago, we are happy to not only bring you a solution which is a cost-effective solution but to have total unanimity on it.

Senator Dixon works closely with the entire delegation. He is secretary-treasurer of the delegation. The delegation has spoken out on this particular issue as a unit. We feel not only as a tragedy it must be overridden, but we have a very good solution.

The Little Calumet Watershed is a 214 square mile region in southern Cook and northeastern Will Counties of Illinois. About one-half million people live in 34 communities.

Just 1 year ago, a devastating flood struck the watershed, destroying $37 million worth of property. Shortly after the flood, more than 50 residents from the flooded areas flew to Washington to discuss the calamity and to show me photographs of their ruined homes and neighborhoods. Senator Dixon and I met with them, as did other Members of the Illinois delegation. These people described how raw sewage and rainwater filled their homes, many of them single-story ranch houses. Alderwoman Margaret Lundy of Calumet City detailed how she and her husband had to remove worms and frogs from their living room. The sad stories and pictures of the stricken area are not simply to be filed away for posterity. Ruinous floods are all too common in the southern suburbs of Chicago. As recently as May 22 of this year the area suffered further major flood damage. One only needs to hear the stories these people told me to realize their desperate need for flood prevention measures.

The Little Calumet Watershed plan is a highly cost-effective and efficient flood control system for southern Cook County. The plan was developed over the last 10 years through the cooperation of literally dozens of Federal, State, and local entities. The project was approved and supported by citizens 'groups and public agencies ranging from the 34 affected communities to the Federal Office of Management and Budget. Approval from this committee is the last required step before planning and construction can begin.

I must say I discussed right here in my office in the Dirksen Building, so deep was my concern, this project with David Stockman, and he concurred, after looking at the figures, this is one of the most highly cost-effective programs that he had seen. He said they will support it, and they do support it, of course.

Little Cal will cost $43 million—only slightly more than the $37 million damage caused by a single flood. There are very few projects we can literally get a return back on investment in a year, not to take into account the damage done that simply can never be repaired and the anguish people go through when this happens. The Federal share of the project cost is only $21 million and can be financed out of current appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service construction fund. No additional budget outlays are necessary.

Once completed, Little Cal will save the Federal Government millions of dollars by tremendously reducing Federal liabilities and future expenditures for emergency relief. According to a panel of Federal, State, and local flood control experts, 99 percent of last year's $37 million flood damage to the Calumet River basin would have been wholly unnecessary. Again, last year's flood was not a freak occurrence. Flooding is a continuous problem in this area. The Federal Emergency Management Agency, after paying out millions of dollars in Federal disaster assistance and reviewing what could be done to reduce future flood damage, concluded, and I will quote directly from their report, "The SCS Little Calumet River project is badly needed," and, "there appears to be no effective alternative to the Little Calumet River watershed plan to correct the long-range problem of widespread flooding in the 34 communities along the river in south Cook County." Once the project is constructed, Federal savings through the prevention of future disasters will be enormous.

The Little Cal project has numerous widespread benefits. Expected average floodwater damage for the entire area will be reduced by 98 percent. Seven thousand homes and businesses will be completely protected from future floods. At present, high water stages in rivers cause malfunction of the local sewer system. The resulting sewage backup in thousands of homes constitutes a major public health hazard. The project will eliminate this problem. Additionally, silt and agricultural pollution in the 109 miles of local streams will be reduced by 52,700 tons every year. The ratio of benefits to costs is a very favorable 1.5 to 1.

Local support for the plan is very strong, Mr. Chairman, and substantial resources have been committed. Over $6 million of the project's $11 million local share has already been spent in land acquisition. State rules restricting new development on the flood plain have been adopted to maximize benefits of the plan, and most communities in the plan area have adopted erosion ordinances to protect flood-protection structures. There has been active citizen participation throughout the planning process.

Before introducing our first-rate panel of local leaders from Illinois, I take great pleasure in yielding to my distinguished colleague, Senator Alan Dixon, who, as secretary of state, knows every corner of that State. He is a downstater, but he knows Cook County very well. He is a man of compassion and deep understanding. We both agree this is one of the most effective projects that I have testified for for 16 years, and that he has seen in his serving in both State and Federal Government.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you, Senator Percy. And I concur with your remarks about Senator Dixon and the work he has done. It is a pleasure to welcome you.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALAN J. DIXON

Senator **Dixon**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for this opportunity to appear with my distinguished friend and senior colleague, Senator Chuck Percy, to make a few remarks regarding the Little Calumet.

As secretary of the Illinois delegation, let me assure, Mr. Chairman, this is a high priority project for the entire delegation. Little Cal has been delayed by the Office of Management and Budget due to a change in the administration's water resources policy. Local efforts in terms of land acquisition and planning have been in place for quite some time. The project was first sent to Washington for authorization in May 1979. The delay was a major disappointment to the State of Illinois and has resulted in flood damage that might have been prevented if the project had been implemented in a timely fashion.

I have met with my colleagues regarding this project. All have expressed their concern. I have met with officials from OMB and other Federal agencies in an effort to get this project off and running. I am pleased it has finally reached this committee and would encourage you to act favorably and expeditiously so the Little Cal watershed project can proceed.

The testimony you will heard from Nick Melas, the president of the board of commissioners of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, from Frank Kudrna, director of the division of water resources in Illinois, and Ed Howell, chairman of the Little Calumet Watershed Steering Committee, will, I am sure, indicate the serious need for this long overdue project and the high degree of State and local interest in it.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in behalf of this project and look forward to the committee's favorable action. I thank you for your time, Mr. Chairman.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you, Senator Dixon.

Senator Percy?

Senator **Percy**. Yes, I would like to acknowledge the presence, and I was pleased and surprised he came down—not surprised really, because he is the chairman of the group in this particular area of flood control—but Ed Zablocki, mayor of Tinley Park, is available. He is not scheduled to testify, but he is available in case you have questions as to the reactions of all mayors in this area.

Our first witness will be Mr. Frank Kudrna, director of the Illinois Division of Water Resources. Mr. Ed Howell chairs the Little Calumet Steering Committee, and Mr. Nick Melas is president of the board of commissioners of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, one of the great engineering miracles of the world, certainly it is of Illinois. They do an outstanding job. We sometimes differ on some issues, but overall we feel this is absolutely a first-rate organization. Nick is a totally devoted public official. And I don't think we could have a panel of three experts who are better qualified to testify on the desirability of this project.

Senator ABDNOR. Let me say Mr. Kudrna has been before our committee on several occasions and we know of his great expertise in this particular field.

Gentlemen, again I just say that if some of your people would like to put statements in the record we will be keeping it open, and certainly we are more than happy to have any comments for the record. We do have a long list today, but we are waiting anxiously to hear from you.

Mr. Kudrna, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF FRANK KUDRNA

Mr. KUDRNA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I ask my statement be put in the record and I will just highlight a few points from it, if I could.

I brought along some headlines from that storm of last year. That storm, as both of our Senators indicated, just absolutely devasted the south suburbs of Chicago. This plan is so effective in reducing those overflowing bank conditions, as Senator Percy indicated, it is justified on one similar event of the magnitude of last year. It is an enormously needed project. It is a project that has enormous local support. It is a project that has the local sponsors proceeding in advance of authorization with the things they need to do.

Flood plan regulations are not only in place but have been since 1976. Stream preservation and maintenance activities have been in place. Sediment and erosion control ordinances have been adopted by the vast majority of the communities in the communities involved. Land acquisition for the structures is virtually complete. We have been proceeding locally and working very hard to do our part.

In terms of the Illinois State Legislature and the Governor, the Governor completely supports this project. The legislature has adopted a joint senate-house resolution in support of the project, and we know of no distractors to this project in Illinois.

The project benefits 6,800 homes and 142 businesses. The majority of those have been damaged at least once in the past and many twice within the last 13 or 14 months.

I would be pleased to answer any question you may have later or elaborate on any of the local sponsorship activities. On behalf of the State, we urge you to proceed with this project that is very badly needed in Illinois.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you, Mr. Kudrna.

Senator **Percy**. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we insert this in the record. I think this particular headline ought to be in the record: "Hundreds More Flee South Suburb Floods." I have never seen a headline like that.

Senator **Abdnor**. Without objection, it will be made a part of the record.

STATEMENT OF NICHOLAS MELAS

Mr. **Melas**. Mr. Chairman, I, also in the interest of time, will submit my written statement for the record and will just take this opportunity to personally thank our two Senators from Illinois, Senator Alan Dixon as well as, of course, Senator Charles Percy, whose help in getting this project off dead center has been invaluable.

Senator **Abdnor**. I can assure you, sir, my office is right across the hall from Senator Percy's, and he has never let me forget this project.

Mr. **Melas**. You will remember Little Calumet.

Senator **Percy**. We call it a neighborhood project.

Mr. **Melas**. As the previous speakers have indicated, this project has been under study. Active work has proceeded on it since 1971. Senator Percy and Mr. Kudrna have emphasized the importance of this very, very extreme flood situation that occurred in 1981, and, admittedly, that is an unusual rainstorm that took place. This is still a commonplace happening because as late as May 21, 1982, there was another rainstorm of severe proportion that caused some flooding in that area.

I am very pleased to be here with Frank Kudrna and also Ed Howell of the steering committee and mayor of Tinley Park, because this indicates that this was a cooperative project under the local sponsorship of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, but it included all the communities in this area and the development of this plan under the leadership of the Soil Conservation Service, engaged in over hundreds and thousands of manhours of citizen involvement, and I think this is the best type of plan that can be worked out.

As a further indication of our faith and commitment in this project, I have mentioned, and I think it should be reiterated, that the sanitary district itself, as the local sponsor, has already committed $5 million in purchasing of land necessary for these structures. All of those purchases have been completed for three of the four structures, and all that remains is action from your committee and the House and we can proceed with the actual drawings and construction to get this problem solved once and for all.

Once again I want to thank you for your attention and the opportunity to present ourselves to you, and thank my colleagues for coming from Chicago to attend. As Frank Kudrna says, we will be available for any questions you may have.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you, Mr. Melas. It sounds like you gentlemen have laid all the groundwork for a project such as this. We appreciate your being here today.

Mr. Howell, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ED HOWELL

Mr. **Howell**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief. I would just like to explain that the steering committee that we keep referring to consists of private citizens, municipal officials, other interested officials throughout the south suburbs in a total of 34 municipalities. The steering committee was created to form kind of an umbrella over this group so we could bring the people together in a common cause. We have gotten yeoman's service from the South Suburban Mayors' Association through the flood committee, of which Mayor Ed Zablocki is the chairman of that. As a matter of fact, I was the chairman of that committee back in the early 1970's when I was mayor of Hazel Crest. And this committee has been working with us in getting the necessary soil erosion control ordinances passed so the local sponsors can fulfill their part.

As the others have said, and I say it too, we have worked on it for a long time and we certainly hope we can go ahead with it in the very near future. Thank you for your time.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you, Mr. Howell.

We could go to questions, but we have a lot of background on this project and Senator Percy and Senator Dixon are only a little way away and everybody else is available by phone. We have a large group of other delegations here. I just want to thank you for coming so far to express your great interest. We do appreciate it very much. Thank you.

Senator **Percy**. Mr. Chairman, could I just put the $64,000 question. What do you think the inclination of the committee might be with respect to favorable action, and what timeframe might you require for a decision?

Senator **Abdnor**. Well, I think it will be going into markup in the next 2 or 3 weeks. We have already received some material on these projects and, as you know, this takes adoption of a resolution by the committees and not the House or the Senate. So I think the action we take will be coming in the very near future. I guess it is, as you well know, how many dollars when we start talking about how many projects we can cover. I was just pointing out, not to put a cold damper on any, we have 162 authorized ones. But we know the importance of this.

Senator **Percy**. Knowing the numbers you have and the work load you have, that is why I wanted to offer my services to talk with any of our colleagues that you feel might not be inclined to vote aye on this. I would like to have the opportunity to sit down and work them over, either in the gym or in their offices, whichever would be most appropriate.

Senator **Abdnor**. Knowing Senator Percy, gentlemen, he will do that. I can speak as a committee of one about that.

Senator **Percy**. You do think within a couple of weeks?

Senator **Abdnor**. Give me 3 weeks at least. I think we can work it in by that time.

Mr. **Melas**. If we could look forward to a July 1 date we would be very happy.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you.

Senator **Abdnor**. We have another delegation for the Mozingo Creek project of Missouri, Senator Eagleton and Senator Danforth. We appreciate your being here.

STATEMENTS OF HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON AND HON. JOHN C. DANFORTH, U.S. SENATORS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI, ACCOMPANIED BY HON. LESTER KEITH, MAYOR, CITY OF MARYVILLE; RALPH CLAYTON, CHAIRMAN, NODAWAY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT; MARK WATKINS; COCHAIRMAN NODAWAY COUNTY MOZINGO COMMITTEE; AND FATHER ALPHONSE SITZMAN, COCHAIRMEN, NODAWAY COUNTY MOZINGO COMMITTEE

Senator **Abdnor**. Gentlemen, we are falling a little behind schedule. I assure you that everyone's statement will be made a part of the record, and we would just ask everyone to summarize their statements.

I can say to the Missouri delegation, as I did the Illinois delegation, that your Senators don't let us forget this project. So we are quite familiar with it.

Senator Danforth, shall we start with you?

Senator **Danforth**. I will defer to Senator Eagleton to start off, Mr. Chairman.

Senator **Eagleton**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I may, let me introduce the delegation that has come from northwest Missouri in support of this project. On my far left is Father Alphonse Sitzman, member of the Nodaway County Board; next to him is Ralph Clayton, chairman of the Nodaway County Soil and Water Conservation District; to my immediate left is Mr. Lester Keith, mayor of the city of Maryville; to my right is Mark Watkins, Nodaway County Mozingo Committee, and on specific details of the project I suggest him to the chairman as a very, very excellent witness. We have Mr. Ray Humbert seated immediately behind.

I will be brief, Mr. Chairman. You said our statements will appear in the record; thus, I submit my prepared statement on this project and shall just add a brief extemporaneous footnote.

The Mozingo project was conceived in 1968. Like many other projects, it takes a long time in the sense of gestation, but we think it is now in the posture where it should go forward. It has multitudinous benefits for the area, the primary one being, of course, and the reason we are before your committee, soil conservation.

The city of Maryville, Nodaway County, voted a bond issue a few years ago to come up with their share of the project in the amount of $4 million. And fortuitously on Tuesday of this week, Mr. Chairman, in a statewide referendum, the State of Missouri adopted a $600 million bond issue. And Governor Bond, who was the ramrod of this endeavor, which both Senator Danforth and I supported, but Governor Bond was the moving force in this bond issue, opened the campaign for the bond issue in northwest Missouri and specifically said in his remarks on that occasion that the Mozingo project was a significant one on his list for the funding of the State's share of the cost of construction, total cost being some $14 million. So local money is up and ready and available via the local bond issue. State money is available as recently as last Tuesday with adoption of the

State bond referendum. And the final piece of the puzzle is what we are here before you for, Mr. Chairman, the Federal share.

I will terminate my remarks and yield to Senator Danforth at this time.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN C. DANFORTH

Senator **Danforth**. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

I want to underscore the particular significance of this project as a control of soil erosion, which is I think a major national problem, but a particular problem in the State of Missiouri and especially in the northwest part of our State. You well know the problem of soil erosion yourself. Missouri has been designated the second most erosive State in the continental United States, and Nodaway County suffers from some of the worst erosion in the State. More than 83 percent of the county's cropland is eroding at a rate of more than 4 tons per acre per year. The average soil erosion from continuous row crop in the Platte River basin, which includes the project area, is 27 tons per acre per year, and from tilled cropland the rate is 23 tons per acre per year. Nodaway and 11 other counties in the northwest corner of the State have been designated by the Soil Conservation Service as a "critical erosion target area" for the 1983 fiscal year.

This project is a multipurpose project, but certainly one of the significant and I think emergency characters of the project has to do with the control of soil erosion.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you, Senator Danforth.

Shall we go ahead.

STATEMENT OF MARK WATKINS

Mr. **Watkins**. Senator, I assure you it is much easier for me to sell my True Value hardware products than it is to come up here and testify. But I think the reason we are here as local people is to show the committee and yourself just the kind of local support that has put this project where it is now. At the encouragement of our Senators and Representatives, we are here because they assured us it would be significant for you all to know that we really are behind the project.

Father Sitzman represents a part of the county that is suffering from a pretty high nitrate level in their water wells and also lowering water table. So obviously his part of the county is concerned with an increased water supply.

The city of Maryville has been very reluctant to increase their rural water because of the lack of supply for their industrial base. Mayor Keith is here to show the support of the city of Maryville for that same basis, knowing that we have a plant commitment from 3M Corp., which means jobs to Nodaway County, but 3M has sent a letter to us saying they will not build that plant until more water is available.

Ralph Clayton is chairman of the Soil and Conservation District. Ralph is from a part of Missouri where we have the problem with soil erosion. A group of farmers came to Mr. Clayton when this project started and were very concerned that perhaps the emphasis has gotten off how important this is to us as far as soil conservation and water supply is concerned and as far as the emphasis it will have on our economic impact and people began to feel inclined it is something that is a major contribution recreationwise. But it does provide a recreation benefit to our area; we don't question that. But we are concerned to point out the recreation part of the benefit is 72 percent locally funded. The request we have for the Federal Government is help with the dam structure and purchase of land which is primary so we can get our soil conservation work accomplished.

So we are respectfully here hoping you can see through our involvement in this hearing that we are very committed at the local level. I am sure because of the $4 million bond issue at the local level that passed you can see that too. We are here to offer any kind of support we can to show how important this is to northwest Missouri and our locality in northwest Missouri.

Senator **ABDNOR**. Thank you.

Mayor, why don't you go next.

STATEMENT OF LESTER KEITH

Mayor **KEITH**. I think Mark has hit upon the points I would like to hit, mainly that Maryville is definitely in the need for another source of water capacity, and this is one of the ways of getting it. We rely a lot upon agribusiness for this rural area. Maryville is concerned too, and this is one help in providing rural water for these people.

Like Mark stated, 3M will not build until we come up with Mozingo, and this will mean more jobs.

Senator **EAGLETON**. Ralph Clayton, is the chairman of the Nodaway County Soil and Water Conservation District.

STATEMENT OF RALPH L. CLAYTON

Mr. **CLAYTON**. Thank you, Senator.

As you stated, my name is Ralph Clayton. I have been a member of the Nodaway County Soil and Conservation District Board for approximately 16 or 17 years. I represent the trustees within the Mozingo Watershed and the County Soil and Water Conservation Board. The county court, I am also more or less representing them for their part.

But I am a farmer myself. I have lived on this farm for 23 years and I have battled this soil erosion and flooding for that period of time. It is an ongoing thing; 2 days prior to coming here, it has been out three times in the last 2 weeks, and I came out to Maryville so that I would be sure to catch the plane down here. I didn't want to get stranded so I wouldn't be available, so I came down early.

But as I have mentioned, my farm is located in this. It is an ongoing thing. Personally, it affects my income. But I am here primarily to support the Nodaway Soil and Water District Board, to represent them, the trustees within the watershed, and the good people of Nodaway County. As you have seen in this format I am not going to go into a lot of that; some of that has already been covered. But the landowners and the watershed subcommittees and the Nodaway Soil and Water District Board would appreciate this subcommittee to add your support to this project. Thank you.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you, Mr. Clayton. Certainly no one questions your great interest and your concern for your people back in the district, and we appreciate the fact you are here today. You had to come a long way to make this effort, and we do appreciate it.

I can also say while you may not have been in front of the committee, Father, you have been here on several occasions talking to our staff and certainly we know of your interest.

STATEMENT OF FATHER ALPHONSE SITZMANN

Father **Sitzman**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Indeed, I may be a little out of character as a priest coming to testify before a Senate subcommittee here, but the need of our area is intense insofar as Mr. Clayton has some pictures here that graphically indicate the condition of our local scene, and we would like to show those to you so we would be able to give you a firsthand knowledge of what we are talking about.

But I was asked by the county court to serve on this committee, together with Mark Watkins, as cochairman. My particular interest was in the rural water. In our particular part of the county the water table has dropped so drastically that the farmers have had to rely totally on surface drainage ponds. And the nitrate level has become so great that there have been instances where babies have become blue because of the nitrate concentration.

I think while the other interests are indeed the forerunners of soil conservation, other things are of prime importance. I think there is the moral issue in there also. We have to be able to do all we can for the needs as are quite evident on the local scene, and the rural water is an extremely important need, together with the need of the city of Maryville and the industrial development of the city of Maryville and surrounding territories. While we are on the other end of the county, the industry in Maryville does provide jobs for people in our area.

Senator **Eagleton**. Mr. Ray Humbert says amen.

Senator **Abdnor**. You have a great group of spokesmen here already. This is an outstanding showing of strength when you have so many people come so far. We really appreciate that.

I might add I have received a great many letters from the people back in your State on this project.

Just let me ask you one question. Certainly these pictures are very, very graphic. The siltation problem that you have. Some of the information we have received, for example, they said the annual benefits and cost in flood protection was on the average for the year $87,000, the municipal and industrial water supply was $251,000, and the big one was, of course, recreation, and, Mark, you touched on that. What did you say, about 72 percent?

Mr. **Watkins**. Obviously—I don't know whether you are supposed to say this or not—but when we were putting this package together, we were told the more benefits we could show in this project the better liking that it had to everyone involved. I think what we are trying to say is our real concerns, although recreation is great and we embrace it, our real concerns are in the soil and water conservation area. And that is how the project started and remains. If you walked into Nodaway County and asked what is the biggest problem, the majority of the people would say the erosion. We are identifying one area at a time. As far as the recreation part is concerned, it does have a very high benefit as the plan has been presented, but what I was pointing out earlier, although this is a high benefit, 72 percent of the moneys put into the project for recreation is being supplied by the local and the State government. We are not coming to the Federal Government for a great amount of money to participate. The only thing the Federal moneys are going to purchase aside from all the dams and structures and waterways and terraces for soil and water is they will participate in the purchase of land and the purchase of the dam itself, which is necessary before we can put all other Federal moneys to work in the watershed above the dam. So it does have a high benefit recreationwise, but most of that money is supplied by the local and State government. The Federal participation will be basically paying, beside the dam structure, will be supply moneys for the soil conservation work.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you. Certainly the pictures show the erosion. As an old farmer, I guess I have an appreciation of that.

Gentlemen, anyone care to add anything?

Senator **Eagleton**. We just want to thank you. You have given great attention to our witnesses and the staff has been very attentive to all the letters and the presentation of witness. Senator Danforth and I thank you and the staff for your attention.

Mr. **Watkins**. Senator, if I can address that issue. One thing Mr. Humbert pointed out is there is no benefit-cost for rural water in the project in terms of dollars and no benefit-cost listed for land development, just basically soil erosion loss. If we were redoing the plan today, we would be writing benefits that are gained from rural water and other areas. I might point out that that also contributes to making recreation a higher percentage of benefit.

Thank you. We are very appreciative. We didn't know quite how we fit in, but we do appreciate the opportunity to come here.

Senator **Abdnor**. We appreciate your coming so far and giving us your testimony. I might say that we hear often from your Senators on this project. They obviously have quite a lot of interest. Thank you.

The Zumbro delegation with Senator Durenberger is next. We are happy to have you here, Senator. One thing about the Senate, they let you know about the importance of their projects. I guess I must confess yours is not a new one to me. We have been visiting about it on many occasions and I have seen graphic pictures and maps of it. So I know you have a delegation here you want us to here. We are waiting so go ahead and proceed any way you care to.

STATEMENTS OF HON. DAVE DURENBERGER, AND HON. RUDY BOSCHWITZ, U.S. SENATORS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA; HON. ARLEN ERDAHL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA, ACCOMPANIED BY DARRELL STRAIN AND PETER SOLINGER, COUNCIL MEMBERS, CITY OF ROCHESTER, MINN.

Senator **Durenberger**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am very pleased to appear before you today along with a couple of troops from Rochester who are just the most recent draftees to this project, which has been going on for about 30 years, and you can tell from their ages neither one of them was on the responsible local body at the time it started.

What I want to do is urge as strongly as I can, and I know I am urging it on someone who has been concerned about this project since you came to the Senate, the approval of the Soil Conservation Service portion of the south Zumbro water project. I have submitted a statement for the record which is longer than the comments I intend to make.

Senator **Abdnor**. It will be made a part of the record.

Senator **Durenberger**. Thank you.

To start off with, I guess it is important to understand that the effort to construct flood control in the Rochester area is at least 30 years old. Rochester is a city of some 60,000 and well-known for the Mayo Clinic. Thirty years ago it was a problem. It is not one of those problems associated with massive urban buildup, it has been around a long time, when Rochester was a town of 15,000 people and Charlie Mayo was struggling to render health care to people in the area.

In spite of major floods over this period of time, particularly including one in July 1978 that caused $60 million worth of damage and the loss of five lives, virtually nothing has been accomplished to bring a remedy to the problem. Action on the south Zumbro watershed project is desperately needed, and needed now.

In developing the plan that is being considered today, the Soil Conservation Service worked with the Corps of Engineers to establish what is a two-prong answer to the needs of the Rochester area. The role of the corps involves construction of 9.3 miles of channel modifications and supplemental levees, and in that regard they are working with the city of Rochester. The Soil Conservation Service improvements include seven upstream reservoirs with associated land treatment measures. The sponsors of this project signed the watershed plan agreement with the Federal Government in October of 1978—4 years ago and 3 months after the tragic July flood. Since then the plan has moved through the Government here with all the swiftness of Tip O'Neill running to embrace Reaganomics. That plan was included in the omnibus water bill of the 96th Congress. Eventually the entire plan was forwarded to OMB where it sat for 15 months. Now OMB has forwarded the plan to the Senate, but with comments that have left me and my constituents alarmed. Favorable action by this subcommittee could go a long way to quieting that alarm.

The OMB letter of transmittal says the administration is in the process of reviewing cost sharing for water resource projects and that the new people "will be structured so that it covered this project." Well, taking the optimistic stance on this, which is not always easy, I will presume that the changes will be structured so the project can proceed under an appropriate grandfather clause.

The letter also states that OMB intends to treat both the SCS and corps projects as a single project for purposes of analysis and recommendation, and OMB says that it will oppose obligation of construction funds for the SCS project until construction appropriations are provided for the corps project. Now it is true that the SCS and corps worked very closely in the planning process so they developed a well integrated plan, but they are very different projects and processes. If the two separate projects are tied together, each project could end up strangling in the other's redtape, if we just look back at the tape we have put up with in the past.

The SCS and corps projects should proceed with channels as separate entities in order to prevent further delay.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to introduce Darrell Strain and Peter Solinger, who are council members from Rochester. I would like to commend the entire group of officials and leaders in Rochester who have demonstrated their support.

Senator **Abdnor**. I see Congressman Erdahl is here and Senator Boschwitz has just walked in.

May I say to the gentlemen who are members of this delegation that earlier Congressman Hagedorn was here but he had to leave. So you have had great representation from a strong group of congressional members.

Senator **Durenberger**. I am just going to wind up my statement and introduce the two members of the city council, and you have introduced my colleages, who themselves have been working on this project ever since they got to the Senate and House, respectively.

We have been here before. We have been at other places before. We have committed an awful lot of time to this project.

Senator **Abdnor**. Let me say that I remember very well our hearing we had last summer in St. Paul.

Senator **Durenberger**. We will catch you anyplace we can get you, Mr. Chairman.

I will end my comments and yield to my colleague, Senator Boschwitz.

Senator **Abdnor**. Senator Boschwitz, I was just sure you were going to show up.

STATEMENT OF HON. RUDY BOSCHWITZ

Senator **Boschwitz**. I was over attending to food stamps, Mr. Chairman, and there was a thin attendance over there, as there are at many of these committee hearings on Friday.

We have indeed made presentations, and in view of that I am going to make a rather short presentation.

I want to thank you for scheduling this hearing, Senator Abdnor, and providing us the opportunity to once again explain the pressing needs of congressional approval of the South Zumbro watershed control project in Rochester, Minn., an area you are quite familiar with I know. Periods of excess moisture, primarily severe summer thunderstorms, have resulted in flooding in the city of Rochester, soil erosion and sediment damage in the outlying agricultural areas which are particularly rich in that part of the State. Major flooding has occurred in 1855, 1908, 1951, 1961, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1969, 1971, and 1978. It is interesting to note the frequency in more recent years, which is probably testimony to a large degree that large areas of all of our lands have been kind of waterproofed. They have been asphalted and cemented over so there is not as much absorption, and particularly in an area of a city the size of Rochester. As a matter of fact, I am very familiar with the river because I had a store right along the banks of the river that took on a little water. We had a pretty good sale as a result of that.

The flooding that took place in July 1978, Mr. Chairman, was the worst. It killed five people. It damaged and destroyed 3,500 thousand homes and businesses and caused about $55 million in damages in that one year.

The South Zumbro watershed flood control project was designed to reduce the flooding to the Rochester area and consisted of seven flood control reservoirs to be built on the waterstreams by the Soil Conservation Service, levees and other structural work in the city of Rochester itself by the corps. The focus of today's hearing is the soil conservation part of the project, the seven flood control reservoirs.

I am pleased the administration has lent its support to the project. Many people have made efforts to convince OMB about this plan. Mr. Stockman and Ed Harper acknowledge their favorable consideration. I am pleased their review has resulted in an integrated plan to provide 100 year flood protection of the Rochester area.

I should note during the previous administration the President decided to hold back authorizations until Congress changed the standards for determining cost benefits. I supported that position in an effort to hold back funding to projects that didn't merit funding. Unfortunately, some projects, progress has not even moved forward on important projects of significant merit; the South Zumbro project among them.

I thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for allowing us to once again state our case on this important matter, and indeed that is exactly what it is.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you, Senator Boschwitz. We do know the importance of this project.

Congressman Erdahl, we are happy you are here.

STATEMENT OF HON. ARLEN ERDAHL

Representative **Erdahl**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I also have a brief statement. It is a privilege to be here on the Senate side. Our loss is their gain.

I am happy to join my colleagues in the Minnesota Congressional Delegation who are here today and representatives from Rochester, who have already been introduced, Darrell Strain and Peter Solinger, to ask your subcommittee to approve a resolution to authorize construction of the South Zumbro watershed.

I want to especially commend our two Senators from Minnesota, Senator Durenberger and Senator Boschwitz, and their staffs because they have been so diligent in working with this project and for this project that happens to be in my congressional district.

Other testimony is providing detailed information about the South Zumbro watershed so I will not be repetitious. Let me just try to bring out some of the rather unique features of this project. This is an excellent example of a cooperative effort where the Soil Conservation Service is recommending approval of a watershed project to prevent flood damage in the area surrounding the city of Rochester and the Corps of Engineers has produced a plan of levees and channelization to prevent flood damage in the community. This cooperation between two Federal agencies is to be commended.

I would also like to point out the strong local support for this project. The county and the city governments have worked cooperatively with the Soil Conservation District to arrive at a plan which merits the support of all parties.

I must also commend the patience of the local sponsors. Despite the discouraging delays resulting from the difference of opinion between the Congress and the Carter administration over water policy, the point Senator Boschwitz just mentioned, the local sponsors have hung tough and continued to persevere in their efforts to bring this much needed project to completion.

Mr. Chairman, since the project has such a favorable cost-benefit ratio and is so vitally needed, I respectfully request the subcommittee to approve construction of the South Zumbro watershed project and ask the Committee on Environment and Public Works to put its stamp of approval on the project as well so there will be no further delay.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you for a fine statement.

Mr. Strain, Mr. Solinger, do you have comments?

STATEMENT OF DARRELL STRAIN

Mr. **Strain**. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity to be here.

Mr. **Strain**. I am Darrell Strain, city councilman for the city of Rochester, Minn., and I thank you again for being here. I will summarize the statement and be brief. I understand it is part of the record.

Senator **Abdnor**. The entire statement will be made a part of the record.

Mr. **Strain**. Thank you. We have one from the city of Rochester and also one from the county of Olmsted, and Mr. Solinger will be presenting the second part of the Olmsted County portion.

I appreciate the help from our two Senators and Congressmen, and I appreciate the support you have shown in the past.

Senator **Abdnor**. If I could interrupt, we have had a statement today from Congressman Hagedorn, and I would like to have it noted that it was made a part of the record.

Go right ahead.

Mr. **Strain**. As the project has been pointed out, it is a joint project of SCS and the Corps of Engineers, and the community has substantial need for the proposed flood control improvement. The city is built at the confluence of four major tributaries to the Zumbro River and has suffered severe flooding numerous times in its recent history. In just the past 20 years the city has suffered severe flooding on five different occasions, the most recent being July 1978. At that time five people were killed and we had about $60 million worth of damage. And I can assure you as being a member of the council at that time and involved in the flooding myself with my family, it was miraculous we didn't have hundreds of people killed on that occasion.

Efforts have been underway since 1952 to solve this problem—30 years. The local community supports flood control improvements and sponsors of the soil conservation project are in the process of forming joint procedures. We have purchased properties to take care of the flood retention construction, one of the seven. The greatest threat of flooding to this community and this area is from the severe thunderstorms that occur.

We are anxious for Congress to authorize the Corps of Engineers' project, important, but we also need the Soil Conservation Service element of the project constructed as soon as possible in order to provide some immediate protection to the community. If construction authorization and appropriations are provided for the Soil Conservation Service project prior to supplemental approval for the Army Corps of Engineers' portion of the project, we would desire that the SCS portion be allowed to proceed at that point so we could get on with it in our community.

I thank you for this opportunity to appear.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you, Mr. Strain.

Mr. Solinger?

STATEMENT OF PETER SOLINGER

Mr. **Solinger**. Thank you, Senator Abdnor. It is a pleasure to appear before you once again, as the mayor and myself did back in St. Paul when you were there a year ago with your field hearing.

On behalf of Olmsted County, a joint sponsor, I would like to enter this testimony in the record.

Olmsted County has been periodically flooded by the south fork of the Zumbro River for more than a 100 years. Major flooding occurred as long ago as 1855 and as recently as 1978. In the 1978 flood, as in other floods, soil erosion in the agricultural community resulted in a substantial loss of the topsoil so vital to the farm productivity.

I am shortening this statement.

A major portion of the city of Rochester and Olmsted County continues to remain vulnerable to property devastation and the risk of death or injury to citizens because of the flood threat.

The flood control projects, as proposed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service, would substantially mitigate the potential for future flood damage to the city of Rochester and Olmsted County and the risk of injury or death to the citizens.

Although the Soil Conservation Service project and the Corps of Engineers project make up the total plan for flood control, it is important that at least part of the plan be ready for implementation at the earliest possible date to minimize future loss of life and property. The community would thus receive some measure of protection until the total plan could be completed.

The Olmsted County Board of Commissioners respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to authorize funding in fiscal year 1983 for the construction of the Soil Conservation Service flood control project even if Congress does not also authorize funding at this time for any phase of the flood control project proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

This is submitted by the Olmsted County Board of Commissioners.

Senator **ABDNOR**. Thank you, Mr. Solinger. We did have an excellent hearing in St. Paul. I guess the message is loud and clear. You gentlemen would like to see this handled as two separate projects even though they are interrelated, the corps project and SCS project. I don't know any reason why it couldn't. We will see how it all comes together.

Let me ask, Senator Durenberger, are there any prospects on the seven flood control dams?

Senator **DURENBERGER**. I believe there are. Maybe Darrell can explain that.

Mr. **STRAIN**. Yes; there is a possibility for recreation in one of the seven dam structures. We have about a 252-acre lake behind the structure.

Senator **ABDNOR**. Very good. Gentlemen, we appreciate your coming to town. I think you can see you have a lot of strength here. Your delegation has been working on this for a long time, and Senator Durenberger has never let us forget the project. We are very much aware of it. We have gone through maps. We do appreciate your coming in to add your strength to the cause.

Senator **DURENBERGER**. Mr. Chairman, if I might make part of the file of the hearing this book of maps. The last of the floods occurred in 1978, as everyone has testified, and this is an excellent graphic presentation, one of the last copies that they could afford to put out of the devastation, which I would appreciate being made part of the file. I notice the last flood was in July of 1978, which is several months before Rudy and I were elected to the Senate. With tongue in cheek, I would say perhaps if people just kept us here in the Senate we might not even need the flood control projects, but I don't want that to be part of the record.

Senator **ABDNOR**. Thank you very much.

Senator **ABDNOR**. The next witness is Mr. John Crowell, Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Agriculture. We appreciate your being here.

STATEMENT OF JOHN B. CROWELL, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY PETER MYERS, CHIEF, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE; AND JOSEPH W. HAAS, DEPUTY CHIEF FOR NATURAL RESOURCE PROJECTS, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. **Crowell**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator **Abdnor**. We will let you introduce your associates and proceed as you wish. I assure you your entire written statement will be put in the record.

Mr. **Crowell**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to be here. With me, on my left, is Mr. Peter Myers, the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, and on my right is Mr. Joseph Haas, the Deputy Chief for Natural Resource Projects.

I propose to summarize my statement and then we will be treating an overview of the present status of soil conservation water projects, and then Mr. Haas will be ready to handle the details of the four projects which are under consideration by your committee this morning.

New water projects generally have not moved in the last several years for a variety of reasons. Those reasons, in part, have been concerns about the consequences to the natural environment and necessity to comply with environmental impact statements and environmental requirements imposed by the National Environmental Policy Act. Also, the Water Resources Council, which had been in place for a number of years, required multiple planning objectives which were difficult to accommodate. There was during the last administration an impasse over independent project review, which also contributed to the slowdown in approval of water projects. Now, of course, we are faced with some different constraints. We are in a time when we have a stuttering economy caused by 20 years of inflation. We are hopeful because we see signs that inflation is now being brought under control, but we are continuing to struggle with high interest rates and, of course, high interest rates affect not only the availability of funds to the Federal Government for all its activities, but also make it more difficult for project sponsors who contribute some of the funds, as is the case in these soil conservation projects, to come up with that desired funding.

The present administration, as I think you know, has been reassessing the Federal role in water development, and it has been determined that the touchstone or underlying principle for all water projects should be that they meet the requirements of contributing to national economic development. It is projects of that sort that can contribute and enhance national economic development which are deserving of Federal participation in the view of this administration. It is also those plans which develop the maximum net economic benefits which will tend to receive priority. That is not going to be an invariable rule, of course, because frequently there are alternatives to projects which are justifiable even though they may not contribute the maximum net economic benefits.

We have a number of examples of projects of that sort in the course of being reviewed right now for the Soil Conservation Service—in fact I looked at a couple of them this morning—for transmittal on to the Secretary of Agriculture for approval required by the Secretary for alternatives which do not maximize net economic benefits.

We also have concluded in this administration that it is desirable for the direct beneficiaries to pay the costs of a project insofar as it is reasonably possible to identify the beneficial aspects of the projects and to the extent we are capable of separating out the costs for particular benefits.

I am happy to say that the Soil Conservation Service projects, by and large, already have been in compliance with the criteria which have been identified by the present administration to implement water projects. The Soil Conservation Service watershed projects are usually cooperative undertakings. They are almost invariably initiated by local sponsoring organizations. The requests for Federal assistance go through the Governor's office from those sponsoring organizations. The sponsoring organizations form local steering committees who have a substantial role in assisting the Federal planners in developing the plans for a project once the application for planning has been approved. Then the local sponsors also establish objectives and priorities and help to select the final plan. They frequently contribute to planning costs and often are called upon as well to contribute in greater or lesser degree to the construction costs. The Federal Government, of course, contributes planning skills in soil conservation projects and then also contributes a substantial part, but not the entire costs, of construction. Once construction has been performed, the local organizations usually have the responsibility for operating and for maintaining the projects.

The small watershed program began back in 1954 with the passage of Public Law 83-566. Since then, it has been almost 30 years. The first 10 years of the program resulted in total applications of almost 2,000 in number, about 200 a year. About half of those were subsequently determined to be either not viable projects or were withdrawn by the sponsor. But in the last 10 years, which is the third decade of the program, the numbers of applications have fallen off quite significantly so we have received only 260, which works out to being about 26 applications a year. We believe the small watershed program has matured and that we have reached a point of balance between the applications for new projects, on the other hand, and the numbers of projects which are in process and in construction.

During this administration it is anticipated that emphasis for Soil Conservation Service projects will be on those which affect erosion control, carry out flood prevention, and implement water conservation. We will, of course, continue to encourage multiple benefits plans.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman. I will be happy to respond to any questions you may have, either here or for the record if I am unable to respond in detail. But if you have no such questions, Mr. Haas will now be prepared to deal with the specifics of the four projects.

Senator **Abdnor**. Do you have a statement you want to make, Mr. Haas?

Mr. **Haas**. I have a technical description of each project, or we can provide that for the record.

Senator **Abdnor**. I think we will put that into the record.

Mr. **Haas**. I have colleagues who can point out the salient features. You have heard the local witnesses. So we can provide that for the record.

Senator **Abdnor**. The four projects we are hearing from today, those are the ones you have given considerable background study to.

Mr. **Haas**. Yes; there has been a great deal of sponsoring of the local organizations, as evidenced by the witnesses here this morning, and they have been in the process for some 10 years or more, each of them. There has been a great deal of local thought and cooperative relationship between the Federal agencies and local people.

Senator **Abdnor**. Did you say the four projects we had presented to us today represent high priority items with your backlog?

Mr. **Haas**. Yes, sir, we think these do fit the current criteria for water policy substantially. We are, as Mr. Crowell said, giving highest priority to flood prevention, soil erosion, water conservation. Obviously recreation, therefore, is of a lower priority in this administration, but collectively these are multipurpose projects and are of high priority, yes.

Senator **Abdnor**. Information you provided us showed a backlog of 160 projects that have been authorized and no startups at all. There are around 400 under construction. When do you think these other 160 projects are going to start up, or are they part of what you are talking about, Mr. Secretary, when you said there have been afterthoughts?

Mr. **Haas**. Senator, that is the total absolute universe of projects that have been authorized for installation on which there has been no construction work. We feel as time goes on with several hundred projects in operation or some phase of installation at any given time, after a project is authorized sometimes it is 2 or 3 years or more before it really moves into full construction or installation of the structural measures, we do some preliminary work and the like. Of those 162, there are right now probably in the neighborhood of about 25 that would really be ready for construction start if we had the resources for them.

Senator **Abdnor**. Well, listening to the four projects, say we approved them in the House and Senate, where would they fit in with the 160? Would they all be up for a review? How will this work?

Mr. **Crowell**. Some of those 160, as Mr. Haas has indicated, have been approved but are not ready for construction because there are other things that have to be done before construction can actually begin. The acquisition of land rights is a common process which has to await the approval process either from the Department or in cases of projects now over $3 million from the pertinent committees of the Congress. Once those approvals have been granted, then some of the projects move in, and the next stage, which as I indicated calls for land rights and then the specifics of planning for contracting. So that the stage at which these four would then reach would be that they would be into that phase of the operation, and it does not mean that they would necessarily be having construction starting immediately because they are not ready for that at this juncture.

Senator **Abdnor**. Sometimes I think the projects we had today are further along, with others, in the groundwork that has been laid, but you will have to review them with the whole 160 prior authorizations.

Mr. **Crowell**. Mr. Chairman, there are 160 of them in this process of having been approved but, as Mr. Haas indicated, there are about 25 of those only which have completed that phase and are ready to start construction.

Senator **Abdnor**. Does one assume, then, those 25 will probably be further along than the new four?

Mr. **Crowell**. Yes; that would be a safe assumption.

Senator **Abdnor**. When do you see that the 25 are likely to move ahead?

Mr. **Crowell**. That, of course, depends on the levels of funding which are both requested and made available by the Congress. We do put them in line for construction starts once they have reached a stage where they can be set for that point. But they then, of course, have to await actual funding availability.

Senator **Abdnor**. So there is not any one time that they can really see their project going to be receiving a start?

Mr. **Crowell**. That is correct. We couldn't make any hard and fast predictions today as to when any one of these four projects under specific consideration might actually see construction started. But obviously the hearing today and the process we are engaged in now is a key step in moving on to the next phase of project implementation.

Senator **Abdnor**. You noted in your testimony the number of applications are down. Is that because we are catching up you think or is that because few even try with those conditions?

Mr. **Crowell**. I think essentially any time you start a new program it is done because there is a perceived need for a new program. This program has been in place for 28 years. I think there is reason to be proud of the accomplishments that have been achieved through it to date. Any time a new program comes along, of course, it would have a high degree of interest. The number of applications that were received in the first 10 years of the availability of this program indicates that was true about this program. I think the fall off in applications is due in part to the fact we did take care of the most viable, the most needy projects initially. But that is not to say that there are not a considerable number of potentially qualified projects still to be addressed. The fact we have a backlog of 160 projects which have cleared the approval of the administration and of the Congress indicates that we still have a lot of work to be done out there in the field. And the fact we have pending applications for quite a number of additional projects indicates there will be reason to carry on the program for quite a long time yet.

Senator **Abdnor**. What do you think would be the optimum time for a construction start if these projects are authorized? Can you even venture a time at the very best?

Mr. **Crowell**. I think Mr. Haas would be best qualified to respond to what the average time is from the point when Congress or the Department approves a project, at the time these four are, to the time they qualify for construction.

Mr. **Haas**. Yes; in normal times it would be in the neighborhood of 2 years. During that 2-year period the local sponsoring organization would be acquiring the land right necessary. Obviously on these projects some have already been acquired. Nevertheless, there are still some remaining. Also during this period we in the agency would need to do the final surveys and actual construction drawing for the project. So on the average we are looking probably 2 to 3 years in normal times before these would really be ready to begin installation of structural measures.

Senator **Abdnor**. When you look over these priorities assigned, flood control, water supply, recreation, and others, does recreation receive the same priorities that the other categories do?

Mr. **Crowell**. No; recreation would not receive the same priority that flood prevention or that erosion control would receive.

Senator **Abdnor**. One project today was, at least by your report, 70 percent of the benefits were recreation.

Mr. **Crowell**. What percentage, Mr. Chairman?

Senator **Abdnor**. Mr. Myers is shaking his head. They have a very high one. I was wondering if that is the most current one. I saw a lot of erosion taking place in that area.

Mr. **Haas**. I might comment at that point. We have to be careful to differentiate between benefits and actual Federal role or Federal cost of the various features. I am not sure myself of the figures on Mozingo Creek, for example, but recreation does, as one of the earlier gentlemen pointed out, provide quite a large number of actual economic benefits. In other words, benefits to recreation far exceed their cost, if one looks only at the increase in services provided. But I think on that particular project the costs are not more than 50 percent, or in that range, although the benefits are high.

Senator **Abdnor**. The cost by these figures is about 70 percent.

Mr. **Haas**. The cost is 70 percent? In that particular project I would have to say it would receive a lower priority than some of the others in the authorization contingent to the project.

Senator **Abdnor**. I was wondering, those are pretty well determined, there is no recalculating to be done.

Mr. **Crowell**. Normally recalculation for the benefit-cost ratio would not be done. But if the benefit-cost ratio qualifies the project for approval and then for eventual construction, the purposes to be served by the project then have to determine the priority which the project would have in receiving available construction funds. As I said in my statement, Mr. Chairman, it is this administration's intent for the small watershed projects of the Soil Conservation Service to emphasize those which affect flood control, soil erosion prevention, and I failed to mention, but also water conservation is a third factor which we will be taking into account in evaluating the priorities to be assigned to construction moneys made available to projects.

Senator **Abdnor**. One last question. We have to move along here. But the Corps of Engineers has asked us for nine new starts with sharply higher non-Federal cost share, of course, and how does this new administration position affect your program in these particular projects?

Mr. **Crowell**. As I indicated very briefly in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, the administration's emphases really fit pretty well with the existing rules which have been applied to Soil Conservation Service small watershed basic projects. I indicated that we have general rules about national economic development and cost-benefit ratios, but there are provisions for exceptions for worthy projects. In fact, it was Soil Conservation Service projects which really drove the process in this administration of recognizing the necessity for exceptions from a hard and fast rule about national economic development or net economic development.

Senator **Abdnor**. I am talking more about the cost sharing end of it.

Mr. **Crowell**. Well, cost sharing, again, the intent is to retain a considerable amount of flexibility for cost sharing. It would depend on the benefits conferred and the group who would benefit from the particular single use. For instance, in a Soil Conservation Service project if there were any irrigation benefits, we would want to assess the irrigation benefits pretty heavily for the portion of the costs which were attributable to them. On the other hand, for flood prevention, particularly in communities or portions of communities that are protected where the people are poor or of low income, there would be much greater contribution by the Federal Government and the governmental sponsoring agencies locally and there would be much less emphasis on trying to impose the costs of those benefits on the residents who are benefiting.

Senator **Abdnor**. In other words, yours will have a lot more flexibility to it than the proposed corps projects they are talking about?

Mr. **Crowell**. Well, the corps projects are so much larger in terms of dollar expenditures that they generally have less room for justification for some of the reasons that I have just mentioned. But even they in connection with flood control protection, of course, the cost sharing aspects are much less emphasized than they would be for something like power development or irrigation or municipal water supply.

Senator **Abdnor**. Well, the corps has indicated that on flood control they have a non-Federal cost sharing of 35 percent, and then on the non-Federal share on water supply 100 percent.

Mr. **Crowell**. Yes.

Senator **Abdnor**. And yours may be different?

Mr. **Crowell**. Well, ours currently for flood control run about 15 to 30 percent participation or contribution from the locally benefited community, and even the corps' 35 percent is a targeted figure; it isn't a hard and fast figure, as I understand.

Senator **Abdnor**. What we have had from the corps sounds like it is a hard figure. We have Mr. Gianelli coming up next week; we will have a chance to ask him about that.

Mr. **Crowell**. As I say, my understanding there was the intent is to be somewhat flexibile, but I may be wrong about that with respect to corps projects.

Mr. **Haas**. I think it might be worthwhile to emphasize again when you are speaking of corps projects they include both land rights and construction to arrive at the 100-percent Federal or local cost share, whereas in these small watershed projects the local sponsors acquire the land rights. So in that aspect there is already a substantial local contribution, and Public Law 566 requires funds appropriated for that act actually pay the costs that are allocated to the actual construction of the project, but it also provides the local sponsor provide the land rights required for that construction. It is a bit different than the corps projects.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you for that good point.

Mr. Secretary, Mr. Hass and Mr. Myers, we thank you for your appearance. We may submit some questions to you in writing. I understand the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Senator Moynihan, may have some questions to be submitted to you at a later time. I probably will have some too.

Mr. **Crowell**. We will be pleased to respond to questions from Senators.

Senator **Abdnor**. Our last witness is Mr. Ed Osann.

We will have a 5-minute recess.

[Brief recess.]

Senator **Abdnor**. We have moved right on. You may proceed, Mr. Osann.

STATEMENT OF ED OSANN, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION WATER RESOURCES PROGRAM, ACCOMPANIED BY REED HARVEY

Mr. **Osann**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator **Abdnor**. I assure you, Mr. Osann, as you well know from being here before, your entire statement will be placed in the record, and we ask you to go ahead and summarize your comments.

Mr. **Osann**. We appreciate that. I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify this morning. With me this morning is Mr. Reed Harvey from our water resources program staff. I am the director of the National Wildlife Federation's water resources program.

Our testimony this morning will address the role of the SCS small watershed program in soil erosion protection, examine the flood control cost-sharing requirements of the program, and specifically comment on the Upper Mud River watershed plan for West Virginia.

We have become increasingly concerned, Mr. Chairman, in the course of the past year about the priorities of the SCS watershed program. As a result of our review of projects currently coming through the planning pipeline in this program, relatively few of the dollars spent on small watershed projects lead to major soil erosion or sedimentation reductions. Instead, the SCS pays for flood control dams, stream channelization projects, and wetlands drainage projects. These projects generally do little to reduce soil erosion and frequently consume scarce wildlife habitat. We believe that over the next several years the SCS should turn away from the environment-altering emphasis and move toward what we and others perceive as its main mission—reducing soil erosion. The four plans before you today unfortunately illustrate this trend, concentrating primarily on flood control, municipal water supply, and recreation—all worthwhile objectives, but not soil erosion control. At a time when soil erosion rates exceed replacement levels on at least one-third of America's cropland, we believe soil conservation should once again become the primary course and orientation of the Soil Conservation Service.

Turning to the question of cost sharing, we note that small watershed projects and Army Corps of Engineers projects are similar with respect to flood control and they tend to emphasize structural solutions to local flooding problems, or other less environmentally disruptive nonstructural measures. Yet the cost-sharing requirements for the SCS small watershed projects differ from the corps' cost-sharing requirements.

In particular, SCS projects, including the four presented to the subcommittee today, contain cost-sharing provisions that are highly favorable in comparison to the latest policy of the Department of the Army. We believe no constructive purpose is really served by wide disparities in the cost-sharing requirements between similar Federal programs.

In its latest request for funding nine new water projects, the corps has established its current cost-sharing requirements for local projects sponsors at 35 percent of the costs allocated to flood control. In contract, as the chart here in our testimony indicates, SCS projects before the subcommittee require a smaller local cost share for the flood control features of each project.

With these lower cost-sharing requirements, the SCS is encouraging local sponsors to build more costly dams and channelization projects. We believe Federal incentives for building flood control dams should be decreased and, at the very least, should be comparable between the Federal agencies charged with water resource development responsibility.

Finally, with regard to specific projects before the subcommittee this morning, we are very concerned that the fish and wildlife mitigation recommendations of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have not been acceded to by the Soil Conservation Service and the local sponsor on the Upper Mud River watershed project. The National Wildlife Federation, well as Fish and Wildlife, objects to this project without the inclusion of mitigation for fish and wildlife habitat losses. During its review of the plan, Fish and Wildlife recommended land to be purchased to be managed specifically for fish and wildlife, but the SCS rejected their suggestion and failed to include a mitigation plan in the final watershed plan.

Senator **Abdnor**. Do you have any reason why?

Mr. **Osann**. As is frequently the cast, cost seems to be the primary factor, Mr. Chairman.

Senator **Abdnor**. You were not in here when Secretary Crowell was here. We asked somewhat the same questions about the different cost sharing. But they pointed out under the Soil Conservation Service, that land purchasing and land rights of way are taken care of by the local group and not by the Federal Government, and that made up quite a difference. I was wondering if you are familiar with that.

Mr. **Osann**. Well, it is my understanding land easements and rights of way are also a local responsibility in Corps of Engineers' projects. Nevertheless, they are setting a 35 percent cost-sharing requirement.

Senator **Abdnor**. I think there is a difference though. We do have Mr. Gianelli coming in next week. Maybe we can go into that in greater degree. But I think there is some difference there, the land the water is held in. But it will be an interesting matter to develop here when we get Mr. Gianelli here.

Mr. **Osann**. Yes, we recognize the corps' proposal is an administration proposal. It has yet to be effectuated by congressional appropriations, and Congress certainly has a prerogative to work its will in this area. We are simply calling it to the attention of the committee in hopes of encouraging a more standardized approach between agencies.

But, as you know, with regard to the question of mitigation again, turning to the Corps of Engineers example, the difficulty in coming in with after-the-fact plans and proposals for mitigation, we currently have under discussion with the Corps of Engineers a rather ambitious plan for the Missouri River to mitigate losses to fish and wildlife habitat that have occurred decades ago, and it is costly. It raises a lot of questions. Options are foreclosed. And we feel that it is much better to start at some point in time, preferably now, to say from here on out we are going to consider fish and wildlife habitat mitigation needs concurrently with the authorization of these projects and have the costs folded into the cost of the project and make sure that the whole package is economically viable.

Senator **Abdnor**. Fine. You were saying in the Soil Conservation Service apparently there has been too much emphasis on flood control and the other benefits that come from the projects. But flood control has to be a considered a rather beneficial benefit any way you get it. If you have ever been unfortunate to be caught in a flood, you have great appreciation of it. We need to put some priorities on soil conservation. I don't know quite how that is computed in their breakdown. You didn't mean it shouldn't be considered at all.

Mr. **Osann**. No.

Senator **Abdnor**. You are suggesting too much emphasis maybe.

Mr. **Osann**. Yes, we are very supportive of multipurpose planning for both the Soil Conservation Service and the other Federal agencies. But we have found in reviewing a sizable number of projects that soil conservation frequently represents a very, very small fraction of the economic benefits attributable to these projects.

Senator **Abdnor**. Mr. Osann and Mr. Harvey, we thank you very much for your appearance. Mr. Harvey did a good job of keeping us around until you arrived. We do appreciate your statement, and some of the things you are asking about we will ask about when we see Mr. Gianelli next week.

Mr. **Osann**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We always appreciate the chance to testify before your subcommittee.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you.

This concludes our hearing this morning and we will stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene subject to call of the Chair.]

[Statements submitted for the record follow:]

Statement of the Honorable Tom Hagedorn
in Support of
South Zumbro Watershed Project
Rochester, Minnesota

Mr. Chairman:

I welcome and appreciate this opportunity to testify before your distinguished panel in support of the South Fork Zumbro River Flood Control Project in Rochester, Minnesota.

At the outset, let me say what a pleasure it is to see you again, Mr. Chairman. It must have taken some getting-used-to to sit in the Chairman's seat after so many years of occupying a seat in the House to the left of the chairman...or should I say to the *right* of the audience, just to keep our political perspectives straight! You are certainly missed on our Public Works Committee, and we wish you well in your new capacity as a member of the Majority in the Senate.

I'd also like to take this opportunity, if I may, to extend a special welcome to a couple of fellow Southern Minnesotans who are here to testify on behalf of the Rochester project as well. Darrell Strain and Peter Solinger, both Council members from Rochester and both members of the City Flood Control Commission, are here and will testify later. I know you will join me in welcoming them, Mr. Chairman.

Water resource projects have become synonomous with pork-barrel projects in the last few years, Mr. Chairman, and it's a real shame. I'm not here to suggest that each and every project that's ever been proposed should be funded, but by-and-large, these projects are designed to save lives and property, and if there's a legitimate use for our tax dollars, that's it!

BECAUSE OF THIS APPARENT NEW-FOUND NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS AGAINST WATER PROJECTS, THE CLOCK IS TICKING AWAY IN SOME AREAS, AND TIME COULD WELL BE RUNNING OUT FASTER THAN WE IMAGINE. I JUST HOPE THAT IT DOESN'T TAKE A MAJOR DISASTER SOMEWHERE IN AMERICA TO WAKE US UP. I'M HERE TO URGE THIS SUBCOMMITTEE TO ACT RATHER THAN REACT, AND MOVE AHEAD QUICKLY TO PUMP LIFE INTO A NUMBER OF IMPORTANT BUT DORMANT PROJECTS.

MY PARTICULAR CAUSE TODAY, OF COURSE, IS THE ROCHESTER PROJECT, AND YOU'LL BE HEARING FROM EXPERT WITNESSES ON THIS AND THE OTHER PROJECTS THROUGHOUT THE REMAINDER OF THESE HEARINGS. I'LL NOT SIT HERE AND PRETEND TO BE AN EXPERT...I'M NOT. SO I'LL NOT TAKE UP THE TIME OF THIS SUBCOMMITTEE DESCRIBING THE PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROJECT, OR TRYING TO EXPLAIN SOMETHING THAT I DON'T PRETEND TO FULLY UNDERSTAND.

I'M NOT AN EXPERT ON FLOOD CONTROL...BUT BEING A POLITICIAN, I DO KNOW A LITTLE ABOUT CLICHES, AND I'D LIKE TO BORROW ONE NOW: AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION IS WORTH A POUND OF CURE.

UNTIL AND UNLESS THIS FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT IS COMPLETED, THE GOOD CITIZENS OF ROCHESTER AND THE SURROUNDING AREA FACE THE POTENTIAL OF REAL DISASTER. JUST FOUR YEARS AGO, A MAJOR FLOOD IN ROCHESTER KILLED FIVE PEOPLE AND CAUSED NEARLY $60 MILLION IN DAMAGE. IF A SIMILAR FLOOD WOULD OCCUR TODAY, THE PROPERTY DAMAGES WOULD RUN IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF $90 MILLION, AND WHO KNOWS HOW MANY LIVES WOULD BE LOST! IN THE PAST 25 YEARS, MAJOR FLOODING HAS OCCURED IN ROCHESTER IN 1951, 1962, 1974, AND 1978. I THINK IT'S TIME TO PUT AN END TO THIS LIST!

At risk in this city of over 50,000 people are over 2,000 residences, 200 businesses, 21 industries, and 10 public buildings. Additionally, the plan will protect over 2,700 acres of prime farmland. We just can't wait for another flood before taking action. Anything short of moving full-speed ahead is irresponsible, in my opinion.

This project, Mr. Chairman, is a combination SCS and Corps of Engineers project. The purpose of this hearing, of course, is to examine a number of SCS projects, but it should be made clear that the SCS and Corps segments in Rochester are critically linked and together form the basis for long-term flood protection in the watershed area. Both are needed, Mr. Chairman. The system of headwater resevoirs and land treatment measures that make up the SCS segment is totally consistent with and complements the Corps project.

Earlier this week, Mr. Chairman, the Corps testified before the House Public Works Water Resources subcommittee and recommended funding for this project. I fully expect the project to be included in Omnibus Water legislation that should be approved in the next month or so.

Back in 1978, when the Environmental Impact Statement on this project was filed, the federal cost of the SCS portion was $15.3 million in October, 1978, dollars. The thing that I found most impressive, though, was the 1.5 to 1 benefit-cost ratio, which I am sure the Chairman will agree has to be one of

THE MOST FAVORABLE BENEFIT-COST RATIOS OF ALL THE PROJECTS UNDER CONSIDERATION. THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO DOUBT THAT THIS IS AN ENORMOUSLY MERITORIOUS PROJECT AS PRESENTLY DESIGNED.

ONE OF THE LEGITIMATE AND FUNDAMENTAL CONCERNS WHEN CONSIDERING ANY SCS PROJECT IS THE PROTECTION OF THE AFFECTED LAND DURING THE PROJECT INSTALLATION STAGE. THE EIS AND CONTRIBUTING AGENCIES OFFER ASSURANCES THAT LAND TREATMENT MEASURES WILL BE ACCELERATED DURING THIS PERIOD, AND AREAS TO BE PROTECTED INCLUDE 17,500 ACRES OF CROPLAND, 3,500 ACRES OF PASTURE, 8,500 ACRES OF FOREST LAND, AND 280 ACRES OF OTHER USES.

MR. CHAIRMAN, EVERY SINGLE UNIT OF GOVERNMENT THAT HAS REVIEWED THIS PROJECT HAS REPORTED ON IT FAVORABLY. IT HAS BEEN INCLUDED IN HOUSE-PASSED LEGISLATION THAT WAS VICTIMIZED BY THE CARTER-LED REBELLION AGAINST FLOOD CONTROL. ALL PUBLIC OFFICIALS I'VE BEEN IN CONTACT WITH ENTHUSIASTICALLY SUPPORT THE PROJECT, AS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED BY THE CONGRESSMEN AND SENATORS WHO ARE HERE TODAY. AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITY, INCLUDING THE SURROUNDING AND AFFECTED COUNTIES, WHOLEHEARTEDLY SUPPORT THE PROJECT. TO MY KNOWLEDGE, THERE IS NO ORGANIZED OR WIDESPREAD OPPOSITION TO ANY PORTION OF THE PROJECT.

IN ALL CANDOR, I HAVE TO ADMIT THAT I'VE BEEN HELPING TO LEAD THE CHARGE OVER IN THE HOUSE TO HOLD DOWN FEDERAL SPENDING, AND MY UNQUALIFIED SUPPORT FOR THIS PROJECT MIGHT BE LOOKED UPON CRITICALLY BY SOME DISPASSIONATE PERSON. WELL, I'M NOT DISPASSIONATE ABOUT THIS PROJECT...WHEN IT COMES TO SAVING LIVES, I'LL PROUDLY AND WILLINGLY STAND IN THE FRONT OF THE LINE TO GET FEDERAL DOLLARS. I THINK THAT'S HOW FEDERAL DOLLARS OUGHT TO BE SPENT...

TO BUILD ASSETS THAT WILL HELP TO PROTECT LIVES AND PROPERTY AND PAY FOR ITSELF MANY TIMES OVER.

I URGE THIS SUBCOMMITTEE TO TAKE THE LEAD IN REDIRECTING FEDERAL DOLLARS TO WHERE WE CAN GET SOME BANG FOR THE BUCK. LIKE THE ROCHESTER PROJECT. YOUR CONSIDERATION AND INCLUSION OF THE ROCHESTER PROJECT IN LEGISLATION COMING OUT OF THIS SUBCOMMITTEE WILL BE DEEPLY APPRECIATED BY ALL OF US WHO LIVE IN SOUTHERN MINNESOTA. AND I STAND READY TO WORK WITH YOU IN THE FUTURE, AS A MEMBER OF THE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE IN THE HOUSE, TO WIN SPEEDY CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL FOR THIS LONG-OVERDUE PROJECT. AS I STATED BEFORE, THE ROCHESTER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT HAS RECEIVED HOUSE SUPPORT IN THE PAST, AND I'LL WORK HARD TO MAKE SURE THAT SUPPORT CONTINUES.

I'M GRATEFUL TO YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, FOR GIVING ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT MY VIEWS.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT
AND PUBLIC WORKS, WATER RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE

CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY
OF THE
ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES
FOR AUTHORIZATION OF THE
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER WATERSHED PLAN

SUBMITTED BY FRANK KUDRNA
DIRECTOR, ILLINOIS DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES
JUNE 11, 1982

The banner headline of the June 15, 1981, Chicago Tribune reads, "South Suburbs Fight Flood - 300 Help in Cleanup Operation." This is not the first time a headline of this nature has appeared in the Chicago regional newspapers. Flooding in the heavily populated south suburbs of Chicago, specifically in the Little Calumet Watershed, is an all too frequent event. In fact, a storm occurred on May 22, 1982 in the southern part of the watershed which caused flood damages for several communities comparable to the flood damages experienced in 1981.

The Little Calumet Watershed comprises an area of 214 square miles, which includes 34 communities and unincorporated areas of Cook and Will Counties. The population of these communities approximates one half million people. It is accurate to say that all these people are affected to one degree or another by flooding.

The estimated overbank flood damage caused by the June 13, 1981 storm in the Little Calumet Watershed was calculated by the USDA Soil Conservation Service to approximate $37,000,000. An interesting fact is that the June 13 storm was not considered to be an extreme event. River stages in the south end of the watershed did approach "once in one hundred year" levels. In the north end of the watershed, where the Little Calumet River flows and where much of the flood damage occurred, river stages only approached "once in every twenty-five year" levels. It is very probable that the devastating flood damage experienced during June 1981 will occur several more times within our lives and perhaps to an even more severe degree. If the Little Calumet Watershed Plan had been in place, these damages would have been reduced to $200,000, a 99% reduction.

It has been estimated by the Soil Conservation Service that 6,866 homes in Illinois, and 142 businesses will flood during the once in 100 year storm. Floodwater damages in the watershed are estimated to exceed $4,323,000[1] on an average annual basis. Damages to residential properties alone in the Little Calumet Watershed due to a 100 year storm will exceed $85,000,000. All this is in the probable future for the people of the Little Calumet River Watershed if nothing is done. Fortunately, the people of this area have been working together for a number of years with Federal, State and local agencies to develop and implement a flood control plan, the Little Calumet River Watershed Plan.

---

[1] Price Base: 1977

The Plan was developed as a result of a PL-566 Federal study by the Soil Conservation Service working with the key local sponsors: the Illinois Department of Transportation, Division of Water Resources; the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago; Cook County; Tinley Park; Tinley Park District; Calumet Union Drainage District and Will-South Cook Soil and Water Conservation District. PL-566 planning allowed local sponsors to transcend local boundaries and act as a collective unit to develop solutions to problems that are regional by nature.

PL-566 planning assistance was authorized in January 1977. The Watershed Plan and Environmental Impact Statement were completed and approved by the Illinois SCS in March 1979. The U.S. Department of Agriculture approved and submitted the Plan to the Water Resources Council in December 1979. The WRC and then the Office of Management and Budget completed their review and submitted the Plan to Congress for authorization in February of this year.

Structural measures to correct existing flood problems include the construction of four reservoirs and approximately two miles of channel work. The reservoirs will contain 12,409 acre-feet of flood water to compliment 1,450 acre-feet of storage already provided by the key sponsors. In anticipation of Federal funding of the Plan, the key sponsors have also acquired three of the four reservoir sites at a cost of approximately $6,923,000. Total expediture by the sponsors for flood control to date in the Little Calumet Watershed is $12,970,000.

The non-structural programs proposed to prevent future damages include floodplain regulations, flood proofing of buildings not completely protected by the structural program, as well as channel maintenance. Land treatment for erosion control is also an important part of the program.

The State of Illinois issued floodplain regulations in the Little Calumet Watershed in 1976. The regulations prohibit any construction within the 100 year frequency floodplain which would increase stage or discharge. The Soil Conservation Service has reviewed these regulations and has acknowledged their effectiveness.

In 1981, the State of Illinois in cooperation with other agencies developed a channel maintenance program (or Stream Preservation Program as it is called) which is now being implemented throughout Chicago suburbs. The program calls for the annual inspection and maintenance of streams.

In anticipation of Federal funding of the Plan, the communities of the Little Calumet Watershed are moving ahead to implement these non-structural programs to prevent future damages. The sponsors are firmly committed to flood control as their actions clearly indicate.

The total installation cost of the Plan approximates \$43,000,000[2] with \$31,600,000[2] of it being PL-566 funds. The ratio of benefits to costs is 1.30[2/]. Badly needed recreation facilities will also be provided in one of the reservoirs as a part of PL-566 funding, which will match local dollars.

The people of the Little Calumet Watershed have worked long and hard to formulate a comprehensive plan for floodwater management in their area and have committed themselves both financially and politically to these needed programs to resolve the severe flooding in their watershed. The State of Illinois supports their effort and has committed funds towards implementation of these badly needed flood control measures. The State of Illinois urges this Water Resources Subcommittee to authorize the Little Calumet Plan and permit the Federal government to become a full partner in the floodwater management program for the Little Calumet Watershed.

[2/] Price Base: 1979

STATEMENT OF NICHOLAS MELAS

CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY OF
THE METROPOLITAN SANITARY DISTRICT OF GREATER CHICAGO
REGARDING LITTLE CALUMET RIVER WATERSHED PLAN
SUBMITTED BY NICHOLAS J. MELAS
PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

The Little Calumet River Watershed Plan studies began in 1971 when the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, and the lead regional local sponsor, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, through the enabling legislation of Public Law 566, began an effort to solve the overbank flooding problems in the Little Calumet River Watershed and other watersheds in the Chicago region. This effort was greatly strengthened by the commitments of the State of Illinois, the County of Cook, Tinley Park, the Cal-Union Drainage District and others to the sponsorship of the Plan. The Little Calumet River Watershed Steering Committee, which was created by this effort, has provided a broad spectrum of public input to assist with the planning effort.

The Little Calumet River Floodwater Management Plan-Environmental Assessment Statement was published in May 1975, after a series of Public Hearings held by the Steering Committee. In addition, interagency reviews and evaluation of full-range alternatives were considered. The Steering Committee selected the recommended system of structural, non-structural, and land treatment measures that were published in the final Watershed Plan and Environmental Impact Statement of November 1978, and updated in June 1981.

The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago has existed since 1890. The District has constructed civil engineering projects which have received national and international acclaim. The District is proud to be associated with the Little Calumet River Watershed Plan.

The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago has long recognized the need for flood control in the Chicago metropolitan region. By population, the District's jurisdictional area would rank thirteenth amongst the States of the Union. On its own and with other local agencies, the District has implemented many flood control measures. The PL-566 program has allowed, for the first time, flood control planning and implementation to proceed on a regional basis in our area. Six major watersheds, including the Little Calumet River Watershed, have been studied in the Chicago Metropolitan area. These studies transcend political boundaries, and are far more comprehensive than any which the individual communities or a county agency would have accomplished.

The District must emphasize that flood damage is a very serious problem in the Little Calumet River Watershed. This became painfully evident from the June 13, 1981 storm which hit the Watershed, causing approximately $37 million in damages from overbank flooding alone. This impact may be brought into perspective immediately by comparison to the total cost of approximately $43 million to implement the entire Little Calumet River Watershed Plan. According to the Plan, the average annual benefits to the Watershed are $4.2 million, while the average annual costs are only $3.2 million. Thus, it is obvious that the economics warrant immediate funding for this urgently needed project. As recently as May 21, 1982, additional flooding occurred in the Little Calumet River Watershed.

As a responsible local sponsor of the Little Calumet Plan, the District has recognized the importance of timely acquisition of the identified land sites for the proposed structures and has voluntarily chosen to secure land prior to the authorization of the Watershed Plan. The District has spent in excess of $5 million, with $250,000 contributed by Cook County, to acquire all of the land needed to construct three of the four reservoirs identified in the Little Calumet River Watershed Plan.

In closing, the Board of Commissioners and the staff of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago have been extremely impressed with the dedication and effort of the Soil Conservation Service, and with the excellent active participation and cooperation of Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as many dedicated and concerned private citizens who have worked together in the Steering Committee to produce this extraordinary Plan. The District and all people of the Watershed, and in the adjoining Chicago region, request the final approval of this urgently needed Watershed Plan.

CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY

Submitted by the Little Calumet River
Watershed Steering Committee
in Support of
The Little Calumet River Watershed Plan
Before the U.S. Senate Committee on the
Environment and Public Works, Water Resources Subcommittee

June 11, 1982

I am Ed Howell, Chairman of the Little Calumet River Watershed Steering Committee. I also serve as Associate Director of the Will-South Cook Soil and Water Conservation District. My home is located in Hazel Crest, where I have served as mayor.

The Little Calumet River Watershed covers 214 square miles in the south suburban Chicago area. About a half million people live within the watershed. There are 34 communities which include Blue Island, Calumet City, Chicago Heights, Country Club Hills, Crete, Dixmoor, Dolton, East Chicago Heights, East Hazel Crest, Flossmoor, Glenwood, Harvey, Hazel Crest, Homewood, Lansing, Lynwood, Markham, Matteson, Midlothian, Monee, Oak Forest, Olympia Field, Park Forest, Park Forest South, Posen, Richton Park, Riverdale, Robbins, Sauk Village, South Chicago Heights, South Holland, Steger, Tinley Park, Thornton and unincorporated parts of Cook and Will Counties. Floodwater damages in these communities exceeds 4 million dollars per year. In June 1981 we experienced a devastating flood causing the loss of two lives and $37,000,000 in damage. Also, as recently as May 22 of this year we suffered major flood damage.

The residents of this area started efforts to solve their flooding problems in 1966 by forming the South Suburban Flood Control Committee. But our efforts were thwarted because we lacked an overall authority to unify all the governmental agencies involved.

In 1971, with cooperation from the Soil Conservation Service and the Metropolitan Sanitary District, we organized the Little Calumet River Watershed Steering Committee and unified our effort with assistance from Public Law-566. Our committee represents local citizens, municipal and other local government leaders, and others who are concerned about the well being of their communities and their environment.

During these last several years we have been working with seven major sponsoring organizations and the Soil Conservation Service to develop the Little Calumet River Watershed Plan, which we are presenting here today for your consideration. These sponsors have already made substantial committments to this plan. They have spent almost $7 million towards the needed land for the project.

In addition, we have recognized the importance of land treatment for erosion in the overall plan. Working closely with the Will-South Cook Soil and Water Conservation District, 77 percent of the communities needing erosion and sediment control ordinances now have them in force and the remainder are now in the implementation process. Erosion control will protect our drainage ways from being clogged by sediment and aggrevating our flood problems.

There is an urgent need to turn our plan into a moving project. Our steering committee is vitally interested in this project and our sponsors are strongly committed to its implementation.

STATEMENT BY
SENATOR THOMAS F. EAGLETON
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

June 11, 1982

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify in support of the Mozingo Creek Watershed project located in Nodaway County, Missouri. This project has been on the drawing boards since 1968, and will take five years to implement once Congressional authorization and funding are approved.

In the meantime, the problems that the watershed plan was designed to solve continue. Primarily, the project will alleviate serious flooding and soil erosion in the watershed that annually threaten some of the most agriculturally productive land in our State. The watershed plan developed by the U. S. Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with state and local sponsors consists of accelerated land treatment, one multiple-purpose structure and four grade-stabilization structures. This will protect some 7,500 acres of prime agricultural and forest lands.

The thousand-acre reservoir called for in the plan will provide new recreational opportunities in the region, and supply the City of Maryville and surrounding towns with safe, reliable water to meet future demands.

Maryville is the growth center of the region. In the last decade, new industry has located in Maryville, diversifying its agri-business economy. But this growth will not continue, as lack of recreational facilities and adequate water supply deter new companies from expanding to Maryville. Moreover, the City does not have the capacity to increase its water sales to rural residents served by rural water districts. Nitrate contamination is prevalent in individual water supplies in the outlying areas which threatens the health of rural residents. The Mozingo project would considerably increase the City's water storage capacity, thereby assuring an alternative water supply source to meet the region's needs.

The total estimated cost of the Mozingo Creek Watershed project is approximately $14.9 million, of which only $4.6 million will be borne by Public Law 566 funds. The balance of the financing will come from local sponsors and the State of Missouri. As evidence of the importance that local residents place on implementing the Mozingo Creek Watershed Plan, Maryville voters approved a $4 million bond issue for the project earlier this year. Furthermore, Governor Bond has promised state funds to make this project a reality. This is a truly cooperative effort between the three levels of government. We at the federal level, however, have to contribute our share in order for the project to move forward.

We are all cognizant of the important role water plays in our daily lives, our farming and industrial operations, and our enjoyment of nature. We are also aware that, uncontrolled, water can destroy our land, washing it away in ravaging floods or subtly eroding the riverbanks. We have, however, developed the expertise to control this great resource, and use it to benefit man. For a relatively modest investment, we can help the people of Nodaway County protect their valuable farmland, maintain the health of their population, and promote economic prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the Committee has acted so quickly on the request Senator Danforth and I made to hold a hearing on the Mozingo Creek Watershed Plan. The Mozingo project has very strong local support, as I am sure you know from the letters residents have sent the Committee directly, and as these witnesses here from Missouri today demonstrate. We would be most grateful for your favorable action in authorizing the Mozingo Creek Watershed Plan.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN C. DANFORTH ON
MOZINGO CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT

BEFORE THE

Subcommittee on Water Resources
Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works
June 11, 1982

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for scheduling this hearing on watershed projects and on the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project in particular. As the testimony of its supporters will indicate, the Mozingo project has a high degree of local and state support.

I need hardly tell you, Mr. Chairman, of the importance of soil conservation to Missouri. Soil erosion can have a devastating impact on agricultural productivity, water quality, and sedimentation. Missouri has been designated the second most erosive state in the continental United States, and Nodaway County suffers from some of the worst sheet erosion in the state. More than 83 percent of the county's cropland is eroding at a rate of more than 4 tons per acre per year. The average soil erosion from continuous row crop in the Platte River Basin, which includes the project area, is 27 tons per acre per year, and from tilled cropland the rate is 23 tons per acre per year. Nodaway and 11 other counties in the northwest corner of the state have been designated by the Soil Conservation Service as a "critical erosion target area" for the 1983 fiscal year.

The Mozingo Creek Watershed Project will be an important part of the effort to stop this area's rich topsoil from washing away. It also will provide needed water supply for the area, and recreational benefits for all of Northwest Missouri, as well as parts of Iowa and Nebraska. The citizens of Maryville, Missouri, feel so strongly about this project that they already have approved the issuance of $4 million in revenue bonds to finance their share of the cost. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge approval of the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project.

TESTIMONY OF MARK R. WATKINS, CO-CHAIRMAN
NODAWAY COUNTY MOZINGO COMMITTEE
REPRESENTING THE COUNTY COURT & MOZINGO COMMITTEE
BEFORE THE WATER RESOURCES SUB-COMMITEE OF THE SENATE
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

My name is Mark R. Watkins, Vice President of Watkins Hardware & Appliances, Inc., a resident of Maryville, Missouri, and Co-Chairman along with Father Alphonse Sitzmann of the Nodaway County Mozingo Committee.

The Nodaway County Mozingo Committee was formed by the Nodaway County Court to help bring about the conclusion of the Mozingo Creek Watershed. The Nodaway County Court is one of the prime sponsors of the project and has been so involved since 1968. The Court became a sponsor after being approached by the Soil Conservation District of Nodaway County. With the help of the Court, the watershed application was sent to the Governor of Missouri in 1968 after several years of preparation by the Soil District. At the time of the application, the project was almost entirly seen as a project for soil erosion control and little emphasis was given the other wide reaching benefits.

The Mozingo Creek Watershed continues to be a project that will significantly reduce soil erosion in the area. Other benefits of the project are so outstanding that the project could stand alone on any one of them. The City of Maryville has seen Mozingo as the answer to an increased water supply that will help it serve a larger industrial base and expanded rural water district. The Maryville Industrial Development Corporation has sold a plant site to the 3 M Corporation, but 3 M has written a letter stating that Mozingo Watershed Project is necessary before a plant could be located on the site. The benefits of more jobs, joins the other Mozingo benefits. Rural water users consider Mozingo the answer to serving their needs. Lowering water tables and high nitrates in well water plague parts of Nodaway County. With limited water storage, the City of Maryville has been reluctant to commit more water to the rural water district, but Mozingo would provide water storage to solve that concern. People who are interested in water type recreation are anxious for Mozingo as there is no such type facility for many miles in any direction.

Soil conservationists, people interested in an adequate water supply, business people seeking to broaden our economic base, and those interested in water base recreation joined together to pass a 4 million dollar bond issue in 1982. By approving the local funding before other funding was promised, we were saying, "We need the Mozingo Watershed Project and here is how we are showing it." In a letter dated May 6, 1981, Kit Bond, the Governor of Missouri, wrote the Secretary of Agriculture to assure him the state funds would be provided to bring Mozingo to the completion.

The benefits of Mozingo are overwhelming. State and local people are ready to fund their share. The federal funds, roughly 30% of the project, are needed to help Nodaway Countians and Missourians to bring about a project that will touch all of Northwest Missouri. We respectfully ask for approval of this project by the Committee so this project can move toward supplying the benefits of soil conservation, water supply, economic expansion, rural water recreation.

TESTIMONY OF LESTER KEITH,
MAYOR, CITY OF MARYVILLE,
BEFORE THE WATER RESOURCES
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS
COMMITTEE

MY NAME IS LESTER KEITH. I AM MAYOR OF THE CITY OF MARYVILLE. THE MOZINGO CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT IS IMPORTANT TO THE CITY OF MARYVILLE BECAUSE OF THE ADDITIONAL WATER STORAGE. THIS ADDITIONAL WATER STORAGE CAPABILITY IS NEEDED FOR MARYVILLE AND OUR SURROUNDING AREA, IN ORDER TO CONTINUE TO PROVIDE WATER RESOURCES TO THE AREA.

MARYVILLE IS A RURAL COMMUNITY LOCATED IN THE CENTER OF NODAWAY COUNTY. IT IS THE RETAIL CENTER FOR APPROXIMATELY NINE COUNTIES IN MISSOURI AND IOWA. OUR COMMERCIAL BUSINESSES RELY ON A STRONG AND PRODUCTIVE AGRI-BUSINESS. SOIL EROSION HAS A DEVASTATING IMPACT ON AGRICULTURE IN OUR AREA. ALSO LOCATED IN MARYVILLE IS NORTHWEST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY AND SIX MAJOR INDUSTRIAL PLANTS.

IN THE LAST TEN YEARS, MARYVILLE HAS ATTRACTED FOUR NEW INDUSTRIES TO THE COMMUNITY, INCLUDING UNION CARBIDE, UNIROYAL, RIEGEL TEXTILE AND NEW ENGLAND BUSINESS SERVICES. IN ADDITION, 3-M CORPORATION OWNS 120 ACRES OF UNDEVELOPED GROUND. THE MOZINGO CREEK PROJECT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT FOR FUTURE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN OUR AREA.

THE CITY OF MARYVILLE PROVIDES WATER TO THE NODAWAY COUNTY RURAL WATER DISTRICT. THE CITY OF MARYVILLE PUMPS WATER FROM THE 102 RIVER INTO THREE RESERVOIRS WITH A CAPACITY OF APPROXIMATELY 150 MILLION GALLONS OF WATER. OUR PROBLEM IS STORING SUFFICIENT WATER DURING MONTHS OF LOW FLOW IN THE RIVER. THE CITY COUNCIL HAS BEEN RELUCTANT

TO EXPAND WATER SUPPLIES TO THE RURAL DISTRICT BECAUSE OF STORAGE LIMITATIONS. THE PEOPLE IN THE RURAL DISTRICT HAVE A NEED FOR A SAFE AND RELIABLE WATER SUPPLY BECAUSE OF THE POLLUTANTS IN INDIVIDUAL WATER SUPPLIES. THE MOZINGO CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT WILL BE A SEPERATE WATER SUPPLY SOURCE SUPPLYING TWENTY-EIGHT TIMES MORE WATER THAN WE ARE CURRENTLY CAPABLE OF STORING. THIS WOULD PROVIDE THE CITY SUFFICIENT STORAGE TO SERVE THE COUNTY'S RURAL WATER NEEDS AS WELL AS THE CITY'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT NEEDS.

FINALLY, NORTHWEST MISSOURI IS LACKING PROPER OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES. THIS PROJECT WOULD PROVIDE FOR THE SITE OF A STATE PARK. THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS SITE AS A FACILITY SERVING NORTHWEST MISSOURI CAN BE DEMONSTRATED BY THE SUPPORT THROUGH FUNDING OF THE PROJECT BY GOVERNOR BOND AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES.

IN SUMMARY, THIS PROJECT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT FOR THE CITY OF MARYVILLE FOR THREE REASONS.

1) SOIL EROSION. OUR ECONOMY IS BASED UPON A PRODUCTIVE AGRICULTURAL AREA. IF, SOIL EROSION AND FLOODING ARE NOT CONTROLLED, WE WILL LOSE A VITAL PART OF OUR ECONOMY.

2) WATER. THE CITY OF MARYVILLE NEEDS ADDITIONAL WATER STORAGE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND A RELIABLE SOURCE FOR THE RURAL WATER DISTRICT.

3) RECREATION. UTILIZING THE SITE FOR RECREATION PROVIDES A MORE EFFICIENT USE OF LAND.

THE RESIDENTS OF MARYVILLE HAS RECOGNIZED THIS NEED BY VOTING A FOUR MILLION DOLLAR BOND ISSUE FOR THE CITY'S PORTION OF THE PROJECT. THE PEOPLE VOTED TO SUPPORT THIS

ISSUE WITH THE KNOWLEDGE OF POTENTIALLY DOUBLING THEIR WATER BILLS IN A VERY TIGHT ECONOMIC TIME BECAUSE OF THE COST EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS PROJECT. THIS PROJECT ADDRESSES THREE SEPERATE NEEDS, SOIL CONSERVATION, WATER SUPPLY AND RECREATION AS A PACKAGE THAT IS COST EFFECTIVE FOR ALL OF THE AGENCIES INVOLVED. THIS CAN BE IDENTIFIED BY THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE RATES OF 1.3 TO 1.

WE, IN MARYVILLE AND NORTHWEST MISSOURI, ARE HARD WORKING, PROUD PEOPLE AND ARE COMING TO YOU WITH LOCAL FUNDS COMMITTED. THEREFORE, ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF MARYVILLE, I AM RESPECTFULLY REQUESTING YOU TO ADD YOUR SUPPORT TO THIS PROJECT.

TESTIMONY OF RALPH L.CLAYTON, CHAIRMAN NODAWAY SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT BEFORE THE WATER RESOURCES SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

My name is Ralph L. Clayton. I am the Chairman of the Nodaway Soil and Water Conservation District Board in Missouri. I also represent the Mozingo Watershed subdistrict of Nodaway County, Missouri.

My farm is located on the Mozingo Creek. Like most of the landowners on the creek, I have battled the erosion and flooding year after year. Over the years miles and miles of terraces and hundreds of small ponds and structures have been constructed by local landowners to help solve the erosion and flooding problems. During the rains this Spring, 5 out of the 15 bridges crossing Mozingo Creek have washed out.

In 1968 the local landowners in the Mozingo Watershed asked the Soil and Water District board to assist them in solving the problem. When the organization of the watershed subdistrict was voted on, there were only three negative votes. Today approximately 65% of the landowners are cooperators with the soil and water conservation district and have conservation plans covering approximately 75% of the land in the watershed. This shows the continued interest and support of the people for the project.

The Nodaway County Court and the soil and water conservation district, along with the watershed subdistrict were the original sponsors of the project. As studies were made and information was gathered, the need for additional water for Maryville City and the surrounding area was recognized. This also brought to our attention the extra benefits of recreation for Northwest Missouri.

At this time, the City of Maryville and the Missouri State Department of Parks and Recreation became sponsors.

Nodaway County has some of the most productive farmland in the Midwest. We also have some of the highest erosion losses in the State of Missouri. Missouri is second to Tennessee in total tons of soil lost. The Mozingo Watershed is faced with these same startling figures. The landowners in the area recognize the problem and have been trying to do something about it, but it is too great to do without watershed assistance. We have been working on the project for 14 years. Some of the people have sold out and left the area. Most of them still have hopes that the project will become a reality.

The landowners, watershed trustees and the Nodaway Soil and Water Conservation District Supervisors urge you to add your support to this much needed project.

TESTIMONY OF FATHER ALPHONSE SITZMANN, O.S.B., CO-CHAIRMAN NODAWAY COUNTY MOZINGO COMMITTEE REPRESENTING THE RURAL WATER DISTRICTS OF NODAWAY COUNTY BEFORE THE WATER RESOURCES SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

I am Father Alphonse Sitzmann, O.S.B., of Conception Abbey, a Benedictine Monastery located in rural Nodaway County. You may wonder why a monk and priest is interested and involved in the Mozingo Watershed Project.

I was appointed in 1979 by the County Court to act on a "Blue Ribbon Committee" studying funding for this project. At a later date, by the same Court, I was asked to be Co-Chairman together with Mr. Mark Watkins, of the Nodaway County Mozingo Committee to try to bring to fruition this Watershed Project.

Since I live and work in the rural area I had a special interest in this Project. Since the '40's and '50's there has been a steady drop in the water table in our area, making it more difficult each year to find water needed for both domestic and animal consumption. Within the past decade or so a good number of the deep wells that had produced for a good number of years went dry. Surface wells became the common source of water, many of these being dug near farm ponds draining the surrounding surface.

As far back as 1968 the County leaders saw the need for a project to control the soil erosion and the Mozingo Creek Watershed Application was sent to the Governor. Since that time a good deal of time has been spent in meetings and actions to further the development of this project. Three years ago the present committee was formed to try to bring the project to completion. Soil erosion is still the primary need of the project, but many other facets have been highlighted during the development of the project, and rural water is one of these facets.

The development of rural water has been slow since the City of Maryville has been cautious due to their limited supply of water in a drought year. During normal years the supply of water in the 102 River is sufficient, but the years of drought create a problem of water supply for the City, compounding the problem for rural water.

There is no question for the need of rural water since the water table has dropped and farmers are relying on surface water. The water quality is questionable. There have been instances of nitrate contaminates being so high in the water sources that newborn babies have had their lives endangered. This need is so great that I feel we have a moral responsibility to try to alleviate this problem.

Our Abbey and Seminary would benefit greatly from this project. We have our own State approved water, but the State is gradually demanding that we have a second source of approved water. Adequate rural water would satisfy this need. We would benefit also from the recreational aspects of this project.

The first goal of the Mozingo Watershed Project was and still is soil conservation, but the other side benefits are conservation on a different level, rural water being one of these side effects.

Senator Dave Durenberger

353 Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510
(202) 224-3244

Suite 550 East
Butler Square Building
100 N. Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55403
(612) 725-6111

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE SOUTH ZUMBRO RIVER PROJECT BEFORE THE WATER RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

BY
SENATOR DAVE DURENBERGER
JUNE 11, 1982

CHAIRMAN ABDNOR, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, I AM PLEASED TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU TODAY TO URGE YOUR APPROVAL OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE (SCS) PORTION OF THE SOUTH ZUMBRO WATERSHED PROJECT. IN DEVELOPING THIS PLAN UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF PUBLIC LAW 83-566, THE WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT, THE SCS HAS WORKED WITH THE PROJECT SPONSORS AND THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS TO PROVIDE A PLAN THAT OFFERS THE PEOPLE IN THE ROCHESTER, MINNESOTA AREA PROTECTION FROM THE CONTINUING THREAT OF DEVASTATING FLOODS.

ROCHESTER IS LOCATED IN SOUTHEASTERN MINNESOTA, IN THE HEART OF A PRIME AGRICULTURAL AREA. THE CITY STANDS AT THE CONFLUENCE OF BEAR CREEK, SILVER CREEK, CASCADE CREEK, AND THE SOUTH FORK OF THE ZUMBRO RIVER. ROCHESTER HAS SOME 60,000 RESIDENTS.

It also has, among other things, the world-famous Mayo Clinic, many other hospitals and clinics, and a major IBM manufacturing and development facility that employs some 5,000 workers.

The greatest threat of floods in Rochester comes from the severe summer storms -- highly unpredictable, torrential thunderstorms that can suddenly dump tremendous amounts of rain into the streams, far exceeding their normal capacity.

On July 5th and 6th of 1978, one of those downpours hit the city. It dumped the equivalent of 5½ inches of rain over the entire watershed, with over half of the watershed receiving between 6 and 7 inches of rain. The soil already was saturated from the rains of the preceeding week, so more than 60% of the new rain ran off into the streams, and the streams gushed over their banks.

The effects of that deluge touched two-thirds of the community. In terms of human cost, a nurse's aid and three elderly women in wheelchairs drowned when their elevator dropped into a flooded basement at a nursing home near Bear Creek. A fifth person drowned in a car that was swept off a country road ten miles southwest of the city.

Property losses were staggering. The final damage figure was over 60 million dollars. A Red Cross survey revealed that almost 3,500 single-family homes were affected. Direct effects reached an estimated 2,500 residences. Some 700 automobiles were flooded, with total damage in that area estimated in excess of one million dollars.

ROAD AND BRIDGE DAMAGE IN THE FIVE-COUNTY AREA TOTALLED ABOUT 5 MILLION DOLLARS, ALONG WITH SEVERE PROPERTY DAMAGE TO SEVERAL OTHER PUBLIC FACILITIES. BUSINESS LOSSES INCLUDED STRUCTURAL DAMAGE , DAMAGED INVENTORIES, AND TEMPORARY LAY-OFFS BECAUSE OF SHUT-DOWNS. EIGHTY SMALL BUSINESSES AND 18 LARGE ONES SUFFERED HEAVY LOSSES IN EQUIPMENT. SOME LOST ENTIRE INVENTORIES.

SINCE THAT FLOOD, RECENT FIGURES SHOW THERE ARE NOW 2,411 FLOOD INSURANCE POLICIES IN THE ROCHESTER AREA, WITH A TOTAL PREMIUM PAYMENT OF $263,710.00, FOR TOTAL COVERAGE OF $82,075,700.00.

IF THE CURRENTLY-PROPOSED FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT HAD BEEN IN PLACE IN JULY OF 1978, IT WOULD ALREADY HAVE PAID FOR ITSELF.

AS I STATED BEFORE, THIS PROJECT WAS PLANNED CONCURRENTLY WITH THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS. IT IS UNIQUE IN THAT THE SCS AND THE CORPS EACH USED THEIR OWN AUTHORITIES AND COOPERATIVELY DEVELOPED AN OVERALL PLAN THAT HAS BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE LOCAL SPONSORS TO ADDRESS THEIR FLOOD-CONTROL NEEDS.

THE ROLE OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS INVOLVES CONSTRUCTION OF 9.3 MILES OF CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS AND SUPPLEMENTAL LEVEES, IN COOPERATION WITH THE CITY OF ROCHESTER. THE SCS IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDE SEVEN UPSTREAM RESERVOIRS WITH ASSOCIATED WATERSHED LAND TREATMENT MEASURES. THOSE MEASURES IN THE SCS PLAN ALLOW FOR A REDUCTION IN THE SIZE OF THE CORPS' CHANNEL AND LEVEE PROJECT THROUGH THE CITY.

The local sponsors have been working on this project for the Minnesota Congressional Delegation for quite some time. On March 5, 1979, I introduced my first bill as a United States Senator, and it was S.537 -- a bill to "authorize construction of a project for flood control...on the South Fork of the Zumbro River at Rochester, Minnesota."

Later, the bill was included in S.703, the Omnibus Water Bill of the 96th Congress. The Soil Conservation portion of the project was also approved by the committee for inclusion in S.703. This was an attempt to move this vitally important project out of the Water Resources Council's non-existent Review Board. The SCS portion of the South Fork of the Zumbro Project had been the first project to be referred to the council by the former administration.

In the final hours of the 96th Congress, I offered a successful floor statement to exclude this project from the Review Board. The project was then forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget, where it stayed for another 15 months.

I would like to take a few moments to comment on the OMB letter of transmittal which, last March, forwarded the South Zumbro Watershed Plan to the Senate. Parts of the letter have caused quite a bit of concern among my constituents.

The letter states that the administration is in the process of reviewing cost-sharing for water resource projects. I agree with the need to review cost-sharing policy, and, in general, the overall procedures for planning and evaluating water resource projects. But I am not in favor of further delays caused by going back to replan, refigure, reformulate, or "re" whatever, with regards to the South Zumbro Watershed Project.

Put yourself in the place of the project sponsors. On October 3, 1978, they signed the Watershed Plan Agreement. This was after the project plan and Environmental Impact Statement had passed all of the required technical, policy and environmental reviews, going through the agency and all other Federal, State and local units of government as well as the private sector, including special interest groups and private individuals. At that point, the sponsors and the Federal government, through the SCS, mutually agreed that they wanted to go ahead with the project. Unfortunately, the previous administration was in the process of reviewing Federal water policy and changing planning criteria, which created an air of uncertainty among water resources planners and project sponsors alike.

The next hurdle was the independent review by the Water Resources Council. As I noted earlier, Congress had the last say in that particular debate, and the project was sent off to OMB.

Now, after an extended period of review time, OMB has finally released this plan for our consideration -- only to tell us that the administration plans to propose further changes in cost-sharing, and that "the proposal will be structured so that it covers this project."

Taking an extremely optimistic stance, I will presume that any of those policy changes will be structured so that this project can proceed under an appropriate "Grandfather Clause." Certainly, 3 years and 8 months of inaction, after an agreement was entered into in good faith, is pushing the definition of responsiveness on the part of the Federal government. To go back and start

OVER, AS A RESULT OF A POLICY CHANGE, IS INTOLERABLE.

THE OMB LETTER FURTHER STATES THAT IT IS THE INTENTION OF THE OMB TO TREAT BOTH THE SCS AND CORPS PROJECTS AS A SINGLE PROJECT FOR THE PURPOSE OF ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, IT IS TRUE THAT THE CORPS AND SCS WORKED CLOSELY IN THE PLANNING PROCESS TO DEVELOP AN OVERALL PLAN THAT PROVIDES THE NEEDED FLOOD PROTECTION FOR THE CITY OF ROCHESTER. THIS TYPE OF EFFORT IS COMMENDABLE, AND ALL TOO RARE. BUT I AM FEARFUL, AND THE SPONSORS HAVE EXPRESSED THE SAME FEAR, THAT INSTEAD OF EACH PROJECT MOVING SMOOTHLY THROUGH ITS APPROPRIATE PROCESS, EACH PROPOSAL COULD BECOME ENTANGLED IN THE OTHERS' RED TAPE.

YES, WE SHOULD RECOGNIZE THE COMPATIBILITY OF THE SCS AND CORPS PROJECTS AND THEIR INTERRELATIONSHIP, BUT I PROPOSE THAT EACH PROJECT SHOULD MOVE AHEAD INDEPENDENTLY THROUGH THE APPROVAL AND INSTALLATION STAGES -- PROCESSES WHICH DIFFER FOR THE TWO PROJECTS. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE FACT THAT THE TWO PROJECTS WERE PLANNED TO BE COMPLEMENTARY IS A POSITIVE CONSIDERATION, NOT AN EXCUSE FOR FURTHER DELAY.

AND FINALLY, OMB TELLS US, IT WILL OPPOSE OBLIGATION OF CONSTRUCTION FUNDS FOR THE SCS PROJECT UNTIL CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ARE PROVIDED FOR THE CORPS PROJECT. THAT IS NOT OF IMMEDIATE CONCERN HERE TODAY, SINCE TWO YEARS OR SO WILL BE REQUIRED FOR DETAILED SITE INVESTIGATIONS, PREPARATION OF CONSTRUCTION PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS, AND LAND ACQUISITION. BUT THE FACT IS, THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS HAS ALREADY MOVED INTO ITS ADVANCED PLANNING STAGES, AND HAS BEEN CONTINUING ITS WORK WHILE THE SCS PORTION HAS BEEN STALLED.

WITH A FAVORABLE RESOLUTION BY THIS COMMITTEE, AND A LIKE ACTION ON THE HOUSE SIDE, THE SCS PROJECT CAN MOVE AHEAD AND BE READY TO START CONSTRUCTION IN 1984. AGAIN, I URGE THAT THESE TWO COMPLEMENTARY BUT SEPARATE PROJECTS BE ALLOWED TO PROCEED THROUGH THEIR RESPECTIVE APPROVAL PROCEDURES WITHOUT BEING TIED TO EACH OTHER.

I WILL DEFER ANY QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO PARTICULAR DETAILS TO THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE PEOPLE WHO ARE HERE TODAY TO PROVIDE THAT TYPE OF INFORMATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN, EFFORTS TO PLAN FLOOD CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS FOR ROCHESTER HAVE BEEN UNDERWAY NOW FOR 30 YEARS. AS RECENTLY AS JULY OF LAST YEAR, THE CITY WAS BARELY SPARED ANOTHER DEVASTATING FLOOD BECAUSE SOIL CONDITIONS ALLOWED FOR THE ABSORBTION OF AN INTENSE, HEAVY RAINFALL -- MORE THAN 6 INCHES. THE ROCHESTER AREA CANNOT AFFORD THAT KIND OF RISK, AND IT CANNOT AFFORD FURTHER DELAYS IN THIS CRUCIAL PROJECT.

I WOULD LIKE TO RECOGNIZE DARRELL STRAIN AND PETER SOLINGER, COUNCIL MEMBERS FROM ROCHESTER WHO ARE HERE TODAY. THE SUCCESS OF ANY FEDERAL PROGRAM DEPENDS ON THE LOCAL CITIZENS' ACCEPTANCE, AND THE DEDICATED LEADERSHIP THEY EXERT IN CARRYING OUT THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES. THIS GROUP OF COMMUNITY OFFICIALS AND LEADERS HAVE DEMONSTRATED OVER AND OVER THEIR SUPPORT FOR THIS PROJECT, IN THEIR UNTIRING EFFORTS TO GET THINGS MOVING. I PERSONALLY WOULD LIKE TO COMMEND THEM FOR THEIR DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVICE. MR. STRAIN WILL PRESENT A STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER, AND I HAVE A STATEMENT FROM THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF OLMSTED COUNTY WHICH I REQUEST BE PLACED IN THE RECORD.

SENATOR BOSCHWITZ, CONGRESSMAN ERDAHL AND CONGRESSMAN HAGEDORN REPRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION HERE, AND WILL PRESENT STATEMENTS TO THE COMMITTEE. THEIR APPEARANCE HERE TODAY IS INDICATIVE OF THE OVERWHELMING CONGRESSIONAL, STATE AND LOCAL SUPPORT FOR THE PROJECT.

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, I AGAIN THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR HERE TODAY TO LET YOU KNOW OF MY STRONG SUPPORT OF THIS PROJECT, AND I URGE YOUR FAVORABLE ACTION.

City of ROCHESTER
Minnesota 55901

Statement of

Darrell Strain
and
Peter Solinger

Aldermen, City of Rochester, Minnesota

Before the Water Resources Subcommittee

Committee on Environment and Public Works

U. S. Senate

June 11, 1982

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

My name is Darrell Strain, Councilman of the City of Rochester, Minnesota and Chairman of the Flood Control Committee. Appearing here with me is Mr. Peter Solinger, also a Councilman and member of the Flood Control Committee. We thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to respectfully request your authorization of the subject flood control improvements as proposed by the Soil Conservation Service.

Flood Control planning for Rochester and its surrounding area involves a unique jointly coordinated approach by the Soil Conservation Service and the Army Corps of Engineers. The Soil Conservation Service portion of the project involves the construction of 7 retention reservoirs throughout the watershed along with soil conservation practices. The Army Corps of Engineers portion involves the widening and deepening of the river channels through the city. Both portions of the project, constructed together, provide 100 year flood protection for the community.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

The Rochester community has substantial need for the proposed flood control improvements. The city is built at the confluence of four major tributaries to the Zumbro River and has suffered severe flooding numerous times in its history. In just the past twenty years, the city has suffered severe flooding on five different occasions, the most recent flood occuring in July, 1978. The 1978 flood resulted in the death of five people and caused over $60 million dollars in property damage. Approximately one-third of the City of Rochester is in the flood plain. This flood plain area has over 2200 residences, 200 businesses, 21 industries and 10 public buildings.

Efforts have been underway since 1952 to plan flood control improvements to alleviate the flooding damages which Rochester has experienced. Authorization for the flood control improvements has been pending before Congress for some time and we are hopeful that authorization for both projects will be forthcoming this year.

The local community strongly supports the proposed flood control improvements. Sponsors of the Soil Conservation Service project are in the process of forming a joint powers agreement to implement the project and have already purchased property which is needed for one of the retention structures.

The greatest flooding threat to Rochester results from the severe summer thunderstorms which can dump a large amount of rain over the watershed in a very short period of time. The Soil Conservation Service portion of the project is expected to greatly help alleviate the threat of flash floods through the retention and controlled release of flood waters. The Office of Management and Budget has indicated their intention not to release construction funding for the Soil Conservation Service project until Congress grants authorization for the construction of the Army Corps of Engineers project. We would very much prefer that this restriction not be placed on the Soil Conservation Service project.

We are very anxious for Congress to authorize the Army Corps of Engineers element of the project, but we also need the Soil Conservation Service element of the project constructed as soon as possible in order to provide some immediate protection to the community. If construction authorization and appropriations are provided for the Soil Conservation Service project prior to such approval for the Army Corps of Engineers project, we would desire that the Soil Conservation Service project be allowed to proceed at that point.

We are appreciative of the support that Congress has shown in dvancing the proposed improvements to this point and we respectfully request .our support in authorizing these improvements for construction.

hank you.

Darrell Strain, Chairman
Rochester Flood Control Committee

Peter Solinger, Councilman
Flood Control Committee

H. Gordon Kluhm, Councilman
Flood Control Committee

County of Olmsted
COURTHOUSE
Rochester, Minnesota 55901
507/285-8115

Office of
County Administrator

Olmsted County Board Statement - June 10, 1982

The Honorable James Abdnor, United State Senator
Senate Subcommittee on Water Resources--Senate Subcommittee
on Environment and Public Works.

Olmsted County has been periodically flooded by the South Fork of the Zumbro River and its tributaries for more than a hundred years. Major flooding occurred as long ago as 1855 and as recently as 1978.

In the 1978 flood, Olmsted County recorded five deaths and over 1.5 million dollars in public property damage. This dollar loss was in addition to that suffered in the City of Rochester. Likewise, many private citizens in Olmsted County experienced personal losses in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Also, in the 1978 flood as in other floods, soil erosion in the agricultural community resulted in a substantial loss of the top soil so vital to farm productivity.

Again, in 1981, the flood waters rose in Olmsted County, but the rains stopped before major damage occurred. Olmsted County managed to survive the 1981 flooding with only a few thousand dollars in damages.

An Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action Employer
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

First District	Second District	Third District	Fourth District	Fifth District
John Sass	Carol J. Kamper	Douglas A. Krueger	Harley Boettcher	James Daly

A major portion of the City of Rochester and Olmsted County continues to remain vulnerable to property devastation and the risk of death or injury to citizens because of the flood threat.

The flood control projects, as proposed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service, would substantially mitigate the potential for future flood damage to the City of Rochester and Olmsted County and the risk of injury or death to citizens.

The Soil Conservation Service projects centers around the seven flood control reservoirs to be built upstream on the tributaries of the South Fork of the Zumbro River. The Corps of Engineers project consists of channel modifications, levees, and other structural work on the South Fork of the Zumbro River. Although the Soil Conservation Service project and the Corps of Engineers project make up the total plan for flood control, it is important that at least part of the plan be ready for implementation at the earliest possible date to minimize future loss of life and property. The community would thus receive some measure of protection until the total plan could be completed.

The Olmsted County Board of Commissioners respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to authorize funding in FY 1983 for construction of the Soil Conservation Service flood control project even if Congress does not also authorize funding at this time for any phase of the flood control project proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

Respectfully submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Water Resources by James M. Daley, Chairperson, Olmsted County Board of Commissioners.

STATEMENT
BY
JOHN B. CROWELL, JR.
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES
COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS
ON
FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1982

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before your committee today to support the four watershed projects you are considering. I have with me, Mr. Joseph W. Haas, Deputy Chief for Natural Resource Projects, Soil Conservation Service, and other members of our staff who will provide a brief technical explanation of each project. As you requested, we will provide an overview on the status of the watershed program and likely trends for the future.

The past several years have been trying times for the proponents of water projects. The awareness of environmental issues that reached its peak during the 70's, the attendant environmental impact analyses that were required, the lengthy multiple-objective planning procedures required by the U.S. Water Resources Council (WRC), and the impasse over the independent project review proposed by the past Administration all served to delay many worthy projects.

Now the Nation is troubled by the severe economic conditions which have resulted from the inflationary binge we have been on for 20 years. Inflation is down now, and, we hope, under increasing control. Nevertheless, interest rates remain high as annual Federal budget deficits continue. Obviously, this situation exerts pressure on Federal expenditures for public works projects.

In this Administration we are reassessing the Federal role in water development and the procedures by which projects are formulated. With respect to the Federal role, we believe that National Economic Development is the appropriate objective to guide the formulation of water resource projects in which the Federal Government participates. Generally, we will recommend the plan that produces the greatest net economic benefits.

We also believe that direct beneficiaries should bear a substantial burden of the costs of services they receive from water projects, and that services should be provided by the public or private organizations that can provide them at the lowest real cost. Federal water project planners should, of course, give full consideration to local, State, and international concerns as they help develop projects, but features included which benefit non-Federal interests should be paid for by those interests.

I am pleased to report that the watershed program administered by this Department's Soil Conservation Service is largely compatible with these concepts. Watershed projects are not direct Federal undertakings. They are initiated by local sponsoring organizations. Applications for assistance pass through the Office of the Governor to assure consistency with State plans and programs. Local steering committees are generally formed to give guidance to the Federal planners once an application for assistance has been approved. The sponsors help establish planning objectives, establish priorities and help select the final plan. Many times they provide actual resources--in services or dollars--to aid the planning effort.

More important, perhaps, is the financial participation in project implementation provided and to be provided by State and local entities. The amount of participation has varied and will vary by purpose. Overall, the watershed program is a joint local-State-Federal partnership in which the Federal share of all costs for all purposes averages about 60 percent. For flood prevention, local sponsors provide all landrights and will operate and maintain the completed facilities; the Federal Government pays the construction cost with Federal funds appropriated under authority of Public Law 83-566. For flood control the local share will average 15-30 percent of overall costs. At least 50 percent of all costs allocated to recreation are paid by project sponsors, including landrights. For drainage and irrigation, sponsors must provide at least 50 percent of the construction cost and provide all landrights required.

We have provided detailed answers to the questions you sent with your letter of invitation to this hearing. I'll not repeat those answers now. However, some general observations may be of interest. During the first 10 years of the small watershed program, which began in 1954, an average of over 200 applications per year were received from potential sponsors. During the past 10 years, a total of only 260 new applications were received, a rate of only 26 per year. As one might expect, many of the early applications were not viable and nearly one-half of them have since been withdrawn or terminated. Of the applications on hand, we believe about 600 could result in worthy projects. We believe the program has now matured to the point where new applications, planning starts, and project completions are nearly in balance.

It is also notable that inflation has taken its toll on program accomplishments. Work that cost $70 million in 1967 would cost $230 million if installed today.

For the next few years, we will give highest priority in the planning and approving of projects that emphasize erosion control, flood prevention, and water conservation. We will continue to encourage multiple-purpose projects to make optimum use of construction sites, but we will expect the primary purposes to be those I mentioned.

For the explanation of the four projects being considered today, I'd now like to defer to Mr. Haas, unless, of course, you have other questions of a general nature.

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION
BY
JOSEPH W. HAAS
DEPUTY CHIEF FOR NATURAL RESOURCE PROJECTS
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER WATERSHED, ILLINOIS

The Little Calumet River Watershed Plan is the culmination of many years of cooperative study efforts by local, State, and Federal agencies. This plan is one of five plans included in the Cooperative Studies for preparation of the Chicago Metropolitan Area River Basin Plan. This Type IV River Basin Study was accomplished during the period 1971-1976 through a cooperative agreement between the Soil Conservation Service and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Final preparation of this plan before you now began in 1977 and is substantially similar to the proposals presented as part of the River Basin Study.

The Little Calumet River Watershed covers 136,500 acres in southern Cook and northeastern Will Counties, Illinois. Approximately 50 percent of the watershed is undeveloped with 58,300 acres devoted to agricultural use. While floodwater damage is a major watershed problem and is increasing due to urbanization and floodplain encroachment, erosion is also a significant problem in the watershed. Erosion on 30,000 acres of agricultural land reduces long-term productivity of the soil resource base. Erosion on lands being converted from agricultural, forest, and idle land uses to urban uses produces sediment which adversely affects surface water quality, increases sewage treatment costs, clogs storm sewers, and is deposited in downstream channels. Erosion from the highly productive agricultural land also produces similar sedimentation and water quality problems. Also, recreation and open space needs in the watershed exceed available supplies. These needs will grow as population increases and development proceeds.

Therefore, this watershed plan has been developed to (1) provide watershed protection and environmental enhancement through an accelerated land treatment program, (2) reduce flood damages by implementing floodwater retarding reservoirs, channel work, stream channel maintenance, and floodproofing, and (3) provide increased water-based recreation.

The accelerated land treatment program provides for watershed protection and critical area stabilization on about 22,000 acres of land. As a result of installing this needed land treatment, primarily at local expense, sediment entering the Calumet-Sag Channel at the outlet of the watershed will be reduced by 20 percent.

The planned structural program was formulated to reduce the $3.2 million average annual damages occurring to about 7,000 residential properties. Inundation of residential property varies in magnitude from the flooding of streets and lawns to major damage from the flooding of basements and first floor levels. The installation of three single-purpose excavated floodwater retarding structures, one multiple-purpose structure for floodwater and recreation water storage and modification of two miles of channel will reduce the average annual damages by 98 percent. The planned recreational development will provide about 125,000 recreation visits annually to the residents of the area.

The nonstructural measures planned consist of a floodproofing program and a channel maintenance program funded at local expense. The floodproofing program consists of two phases. The first phase will provide to units of Government detailed flood hazard information for the area identified by the 100-year flood. Also provided to governmental units will be sample specifications and standards for floodproofing measures. Phase two consists of installing floodproofing measures by individual property owners. Typical floodproofing measures to be installed are flap gates, sump pumps, barricades to seal openings and small dikes.

The stream channel maintenance program will consist of periodic reconnaissance, removal of debris and trash, removal of sediment and management of vegetation. This will be accomplished through local cooperative agreements between the appropriate State and local governmental agencies.

The total cost of this project bringing costs in the plan to 1981 price base is estimated to be $53,300,000. About $39,100,000 will be from Public Law 83-566 funds and $14,200,000 from other funds. The average annual benefits are $5,700,000 and the average annual costs are $3,900,000 for a net annual benefit of $1,800,000.

SOUTH ZUMBRO WATERSHED, MINNESOTA

Early local interest in the South Zumbro Watershed began in 1962 following the severe March storm event causing major damages in the city of Rochester, Minnesota. Both the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) and the Corps of Engineers were invited by the local sponsors to assist them in developing a plan to solve their flooding problems. During the early years of planning, it became apparent that both the Corps of Engineers and SCS could play a role in solving these floodwater problems and other watershed problems to the mutual benefit of everyone. As a result, a Memorandum of Understanding between SCS and the Corps of Engineers was developed to foster coordination in jointly preparing flood damage reduction plans for the city of Rochester and the South Zumbro Watershed.

This Memorandum of Understanding has led to the point where the Corps of Engineers progressed to the design stage in the lower reaches of the South Fork Zumbro River and SCS has completed the final plan and environmental impact statement. Approval of this plan-EIS will permit the sponsors and SCS to enter into final designs for the structural and land treatment aspects of the coordinated effort.

We are here today to present that portion of the selected plan for which the sponsors have requested SCS assistance.

For point of reference, the South Zumbro Watershed is located in Olmsted and Dodge Counties in southeastern Minnesota and has a drainage area of 200,540 acres. The city of Rochester, located in the northcentral portion of the watershed, is the trade center for this largely agricultural area.

The major water resource problem in the watershed is flooding in Rochester. Flooding occurs to some extent about every other year. The city is situated on the floor of a bowl-shaped valley where the South Fork of the Zumbro River is joined by Cascade Creek from the west, Silver Creek from the east, and Bear Creek from the south. About one-third of the city is located in the floodplain where about 2,500 residences, businesses, industries, and public and other structures are located. Average annual damages exceeding $5 million are experienced by these facilities.

Other water resource problems include flooding on approximately 10,600 acres of agricultural land, to roads and bridges, and to other agricultural related items such as fences and buildings. This flooding causes interruption in farming activities resulting in inefficient operations.

In addition, soil erosion and sediment deposition occur throughout the watershed to approximately 44,000 acres causing reduced productivity of farmland. Silver Lake in Rochester and Mayowood Lake on the South Fork Zumbro River are experiencing severe sedimentation problems which is depleting the limited water storage available.

The sponsors, after consideration of several alternatives with citizens of the watershed, SCS, the State of Minnesota, and the Corps of Engineers, selected this plan as the one that best meets their goals. These goals include reducing the severe flood threat to lives and property in Rochester, providing water-based recreational opportunities to the area residents and conserving and protecting the agricultural resource base.

The selected plan involves works of improvement to be installed under authorities administered by SCS and the Corps of Engineers. This plan responds to SCS's responsibility and includes the installation of six single-purpose flood prevention structures, one multiple-purpose flood prevention-recreation structure, recreation facilities, and accelerated land treatment measures. This plan will assist in reducing the threat to human lives, provide flood protection to approximately 2,500 homes, business establishments and other structures, and provide reduced flooding on 2,700 acres of farmland. In addition, this plan will reduce floodwater and sediment damages to roads and bridges, and will reduce other agricultural damages throughout the watershed. The multiple-purpose development includes a 118-acre land and water-based recreation facility to accommodate 68,320 recreation visits annually from residents of the area.

The total cost of this project bringing costs in the plan up to 1981 price base is estimated to be $17,000,000. This includes $10,800,000 of Public Law 83-566 funds and $6,200,000 of other funds. The total average annual benefits attributable to SCS administered structural portion of the selected plan is $1,600,000 as compared to an average annual cost of $1,200,000 for a net benefit of $400,000 per year.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised us that because this project is a joint effort with the Corps of Engineers, the Administration supports necessary preconstruction planning but opposes construction funds in advance of the Corps of Engineers' project. Corps of Engineers' portion will probably be ready for construction in 1984. You should also know that the Administration is in the process of reviewing cost sharing for water projects. If a change is recommended to the Congress, the proposal will be structured to cover the South Zumbro Watershed project.

MOZINGO CREEK WATERSHED, MISSOURI

The Mozingo Creek Watershed is located in central Nodaway County in the northwestern corner of Missouri. The drainage area is approximately 24,000 acres of predominately agricultural use. Initial interest in the Mozingo Creek Watershed began in 1967. These early efforts concentrated mostly on erosion protection and flood prevention. Sheet erosion on cropland is the largest sediment producer in the watershed. Gully erosion is also active in the watershed affecting about 12,000 acres. Gullies result in the destruction of land and loss of production both in the immediate area of the gullies and in the drainage area above. Sediment deposition damages occur on about 1,000 acres of floodplain reducing productivity by 30 percent.

Flooding is a major problem in the bottomlands along Mozingo Creek and the common floodplain of Mozingo Creek and the 102 River. Approximately 3,300 acre of agricultural land floods from the 100-year frequency storm event. A storm of 5-year frequency causes flooding on almost 2,400 acres of floodplain affecting corn and soybean production significantly.

While these studies were proceeding, the city of Maryville became involved as a result of a search for a dependable water supply. Maryville and Nodaway County have an increasing population, industrial development, and enrollment at Northwest Missouri State University. This trend is expected to continue.

Also, rural water districts surround the city and are expected to greatly increase their service areas. The city of Maryville, located just to the west of the watershed, receives its present water supply from a small reservoir created by a low head dam on the 102 River. Pollution from the river and limited storage capacity forced the city to look for alternative sources to meet present and projected future needs.

In addition, as public involvement became more active, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Division of Parks and Recreation, became interested in participating as a sponsor of the project. Within the outlying Northwest Region of Missouri there are few recreational areas managed for the public. Those present offer limited recreational opportunities. The Missouri Action Plan for Recreation Area Development as listed in the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan identified a need for an additional 6,500 acres of State and Federal park and hunting lands by 1980 in the Northwest portion of the State. The Action Plan further stated that some of these needs could be met by the small watershed program through cooperation between SCS and the Department of Natural Resources.

This plan provides for accelerated land treatment along with one multiple-purpose structure and four large grade-stabilization structures.

As part of the accelerated land treatment, cost sharing will be made available on permanent-type conservation measures providing adequate protection for 10,000 acres. This includes installation of 64 small grade-stabilization structures to control the many gullies in the watershed. The productivity of the soil resources will be protected and sediment delivered to the mouth of Mozingo Creek will be reduced by 79 percent. The four large grade-stabilization structures will provide stable outlets for an additional 1,270 acres.

The largest structural measure is a multiple-purpose dam to provide flood prevention, recreation, and water supply. This structure will control 20.9 square miles of drainage area and will provide storage of about 24,000 acre-feet. Annual crop and pasture flood damage will be reduced 40 percent. Other agricultural problems such as fence damage, debris deposition, and loss of farm equipment will be reduced 41 percent and nonagricultural damages, primarily to roads and bridges, will be reduced 56 percent.

The recreation development will provide facilities for about 400,000 recreation visits annually to the 1,000 acre lake. A total of 10,200 acre-feet of water will serve as a supplemental water supply for the city of Maryville and surrounding rural areas served by public water districts. In addition to domestic supplies, the water will also serve the growing industrial sector of Maryville.

The total cost of this project, bringing costs in the plan to 1981 price base, is estimated to be $15,500,000 of which $4,800,000 will be Public Law 83-566 funds and $10,700,000 will be from other sources. This high percent investment on the part of the local sponsors shows the strong local support and interest in this project. The total average annual benefits are estimated to be $1,700,000 as compared to total average annual costs of $1,300,000 for a net annual benefit of $400,000.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised us that recreation which is the primary benefit of this project is currently not a high budget priority. This project would be covered by any new cost sharing proposal the Administration recommends to Congress.

UPPER MUD RIVER WATERSHED, WEST VIRGINIA

The Upper Mud River Watershed is located in Lincoln and Boone Counties in southwestern West Virginia. It includes all of the drainage area of Mud River from its headwaters to the confluence with Middle Fork of Mud River, an area of about 62,000 acres.

The only incorporated city in the watershed is Hamlin, the county seat of Lincoln County. Hamlin is located approximately 35 miles southwest of Charleston, the State Capital, and about 28 miles southeast of Huntington.

The major watershed problem is frequent flooding of residences, agricultural lands, businesses, industries, roads, bridges, and utilities. Flooding within the watershed causes an estimated average annual damage of $100,000. As recently as December 1978 a storm estimated at a 70-year frequency event or occurring only an average of once every 70 years, caused about $550,000 damage in Lincoln County and also caused one death by drowning.

Erosion problems are occurring on unimproved roads, access roads to gas wells and logging operations, streambanks, some overgrazed pastures, and partially stabilized surface mines. The watershed also has insufficient recreation opportunities to meet current demands from local residents.

The plan to solve these problems includes installation of conservation land treatment measures, a multiple-purpose floodwater retarding and recreation structure, recreation facilities, and preparation of floodplain maps. These maps will assist the sponsors in adopting policies to be used in regulating development within the 100-year with-project floodplain. The city of Hamlin and Lincoln County are participants under the National Flood Insurance Program administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration.

Conservation measures will be installed on about 57,500 acres of watershed land. This includes the cooperative fire protection program on the forest land.

The planned multiple-purpose structure is located just below the point where the Left Fork Mud River joins the Mud River and controls about 50 percent of the drainage area.

Flood storage in this structure will reduce the 100-year flood stage in Hamlin by about 3 feet and will provide first floor protection from the 100-year frequency flood to 83 residential buildings, four garages, eighteen commerical buildings, one church, and twelve farm buildings throughout the watershed, significantly reducing the threat to loss of life.

In addition to significantly reducing the flooding in the watershed, this structure will also provide a 307-acre recreation lake. This lake will be in public ownership and will provide public fishing and recreation opportunities for about 100,000 visitors each year.

The total cost of this project, bringing costs in the plan to 1981 price base, is estimated to be $7,300,000, of which $3,500,000 will be provided from Public Law 83-566 funds and $3,800,000 from other funds. The average annual benefits amount to $429,000 and the average annual costs are $421,000 which provide an annual net benefit of $8,000.

The Administration has indicated that any water resources cost sharing proposal they made to Congress would apply to the Upper Mud River Watershed project.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250

JUL 6 1982

Honorable James Abdnor
Chairman
Subcommittee on Water Resources
Committee on Environment and Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Your letter of June 14, 1982, requested answers for the record as followup to testimony about the small watershed program and, in particular, on four watershed projects.

Enclosed are the responses. Also included are views on the testimony presented by Mr. Osann of the National Wildlife Federation.

Sincerely,

John B. Crowell, Jr.

John B. Crowell, Jr.
Assistant Secretary for
Natural Resources & Environment

Enclosure

Abdnor - Please Provide a year-by-year breakdown of when the various projects in P.L. 566 construction backlog were authorized.

Crowell - The information is as follows:

PROJECT	NAME	DATE
AL	BEAR CREEK-SOUTHEAST CHOCTAWHATCHEE RIVE	4/82
AL2016	BIG NANCE CREEK	10/63
AL2035	BUCK CREEK	9/79
AL2020	CHOCCOLOCCO CREEK	9/65
AL2019	CROOKED CREEK	8/65
AL2032	CYPRESS CREEK (TN)	10/78
AL2033	DYNNE CREEK	7/79
AL2034	FACTORY CREEK	7/79
AL2029	MUSH CREEK	10/74
AL2010	POWELL CREEK	7/61
AL2028	TALLASEEHATCHIE CREEK	6/71
AL2014	TOWN CREEK	10/62
AL2036	WILKERSON CREEK	12/79
AR2013	BIG CREEK (CRAIGHEAD)	8/61
AR2037	BIG RUNNING WATER DITCH	4/69
AR2055	BOIS D'ARC BAYOU	7/79
AR2039	CEDAR-PINEY CREEKS	4/69
AR2043	DES ARC BAYOU	8/69
AR2048	FISH BAYOU	6/70
AR2052	FLAT ROCK CREEK	11/75
AR2036	FOURCHE CREEK	4/69
AR2041	LARKIN CREEK	4/69
AR2023	LEE-PHILLIPS	8/64
AR2034	NORTH FORK OF OZAN CREEK	8/66
AR2053	OZAN CREEKS	7/76
AR2056	PLUM BAYOU(FLAT BAYOU PORTION)	2/82
AR2042	POINSETT	7/69
AR2017	POTEAU RIVER	6/63
AR2054	SOUTH FORK	9/78
AR2038	SOUTH FOURCHE	4/69
AR2051	UPPER OUACHITA RIVER	10/70
AR2050	UPPER PETIT JEAN	9/70
AR2045	UPPER TRI-COUNTY	8/69
AZ2006	APACHE JUNCTION-GILBERT	10/63
AZ2005	BUCKHORN-MESA	7/63
AZ2010	HARQUAHALA VALLEY	4/69
AZ2013	PERILLA MOUNTAIN	7/74
AZ2007	WILLIAMS-CHANDLER	10/63
CA2014	BEARDSLEY	8/66
CA2021	CARPINTERIA VALLEY	7/69
CA2006	CENTRAL SONOMA	7/58
CA2016	LOWER LLAGAS CREEK	4/69
CA2022	LOWER PINE CREEK	5/70
CA2008	MARSH-KELLOGG CREEK	9/59
CA2018	MUSTANG CREEK	4/69
CA2013	REVOLON	10/65
CA2020	UPPER LLAGAS CREEK	4/69
CO2017	BOXELDER CREEK	4/74
CO2012	HOME SUPPLY	9/64
CO2019	SEDGWICK-SAND DRAWS	9/76
CO2018	TRINCHERA (COSTILLA)	2/76
CT2009	AVERY BROOK	9/77
CT2007	FARM BROOK	5/65

PROJECT	NAME	DATE
CT2010	NECK RIVER	9/78
CT2008	NORWALK RIVER	8/66
CT2005	SOUTH BRANCH PARK RIVER	8/61
DE2003	MARSHYHOPE CREEK	8/64
DE2004	UPPER CHOPTANK RIVER	9/65
DE2002	UPPER NANTICOKE RIVER	7/58
FL2011	JUMPER CREEK	7/63
FL2019	LOXAHATCHEE SUB-DRAINAGE DISTRICT	5/70
FL2016	PALATLAKAHA RIVER	8/66
FL2017	POND CREEK	4/69
FL2008	SARASOTA WEST COAST	9/61
FL2020	SOUTH FLORIDA CONSERVANCY DISTRICT	5/70
GA2033	BEAVERDAM CREEK	9/64
GA2044	BIG CEDAR CREEK	10/66
GA2055	BIG CREEK	5/70
GA2053	BIG SLOUGH	7/69
GA2060	CEDAR CREEK	6/71
GA2027	DRY CREEK	4/64
GA2040	EUHARLEE CREEK	8/66
GA2037	GROVE RIVER	9/65
GA2011	HEAD OF LITTLE TENNESSEE RIVER	6/59
GA2058	HEADWATERS OF THE CHATTOOGA RIVER	9/70
GA2029	HIAWASSEE RIVER	7/64
GA2049	HUDSON RIVER	4/69
GA2056	LITTLE CREEK	5/70
GA2043	LITTLE SANDY CREEK & TRAIL CREEK	10/66
GA2035	LOWER LITTLE TALLAPOOSA RIVER	7/65
GA2023	MIDDLE FORK BROAD RIVER	7/62
GA2026	MIDDLE OCONEE-WALNUT CREEK	3/64
GA2061	MIDDLE RIVER	3/72
GA2063	MILL BRANCH	9/76
GA2059	NORTH OCONEE RIVER	9/70
GA2041	PINE LOG TRIBUTARY	8/66
GA2042	SALLACOA CREEK AREA	8/66
GA2057	SOQUE	5/70
GA2036	SOUTH FORK OF BROAD RIVER	9/65
GA2050	SUWANEE CREEK	4/69
GA2051	TESNATEE CREEK	4/69
GA2062	UPPER MULBERRY RIVER	10/74
HI2007	HONOLUA	9/76
HI2006	KAHALUU	3/72
HI2008	WAILUKA-ALENAIO	9/76
IA2044	BACON CREEK	5/73
IA2010	BADGER CREEK	6/60
IA2027	BLOCKTON	4/64
IA2041	LEDGEWOOD CREEK	9/69
IA2048	LITTLE RIVER	12/77
IA2009	MILL-PICAYUNE CREEK	6/60
IA2031	MOSQUITO OF HARRISON	10/65
IA2039	NORTH PIGEON	4/69
IA2043	SIMON RUN	7/70
IA2036	THREE MILE CREEK	8/66
IA2045	TROUBLESOME CREEK	7/74

PROJECT	NAME	DATE
IA2030	TURKEY CREEK	8/65
IA2046	TWELVE MILE CREEK	10/74
IA2040	WAUBONSIE CREEK	4/69
ID2007	GEORGETOWN CREEK	4/69
ID2009	HAZELTON BUTTE	1/82
ID2005	MONTPELIER CREEK	9/64
ID2008	ROCK CREEK -SUBLETT	7/81
ID2006	TRAIL CREEK	7/67
IL	ASH-LOOP	12/81
IL2016	BAY CREEK	4/69
IL2015	COAL & CRANE CREEK	10/66
IL2011	LITTLE CACHE CREEK	12/63
IL2022	MENDOTA	1/74
IL2017	MILL CREEK	4/69
IL2005	SHOAL CREEK	6/59
IL2023	UPPER SALT CREEK	10/74
IN2036	ANDERSON RIVER	10/78
IN2013	BACHELOR RUN	4/64
IN2034	BAILEY-COX-NEWTSON	9/76
IN2003	BUSSERON	8/58
IN2025	DELANEY CREEK	4/69
IN2031	EAST FORK OF WHITEWATER RIVER	10/74
IN2030	FALL CREEK	11/73
IN2035	HALL-FLAT CREEK	9/76
[illegible]	JORDAN CREEK	6/76
IN2027	LITTLE WALNUT CREEK	4/69
IN2007	MIDDLE FORK OF ANDERSON RIVER	8/61
IN2017	MUDDY FORK OF SILVER CREEK	8/65
IN2014	PRAIRIE CREEK (VIGO)	8/64
IN2022	PRIDES CREEK	10/66
IN2010	STUCKER FORK	9/62
IN2016	TWIN-RUSH CREEK	4/65
IN2020	UPPER BIG BLUE RIVER	8/66
IN2023	WEST BOGGS CREEK	10/66
KS2048	BIG CREEK	7/72
KS2036	CROSS CREEK	4/69
KS2056	DRY CREEK	2/80
KS2045	EAST SECTOR WHITEWATER RIVER	10/71
KS2022	GRANT-SHANGHAI CREEKS	12/63
KS	GRASSHOPPER-COAL CREEK	5/82
KS2038	LOWER ELK RIVER	4/69
KS2040	LOWER SALT CREEK	4/69
KS2041	LYONS CREEK	8/69
KS2055	MIDDLE CREEK (LINN & MIAMI)	7/79
KS2050	MIDDLE WALNUT	9/76
KS2031	NORTH BLACK VERMILLION	8/66
KS2047	NORTH SECTOR UPPER WALNUT	7/72
KS2057	PEYTON CREEK	1/82
KS2049	SAND CREEK	4/76
KS2046	SOUTH SECTOR UPPER WALNUT	4/72
KS2035	SPILLMAN CREEK	2/67
KS2027	TIMBER CREEK	9/65
KS2029	TURKEY CREEK	10/65

PROJECT	NAME	DATE
KS2032	UPPER BLACK VERMILLION	8/66
KS2039	UPPER SALT CREEK	4/69
KS2033	UPPER WAKARUSA	10/66
KS2044	WEST SECTOR WHITEWATER RIVER	6/71
KS2051	WET WALNUT SUBWATERSHED NO. 1	10/78
KS2052	WET WALNUT SUBWATERSHED NO. 2	7/79
KS2053	WET WALNUT SUBWATERSHED NO. 3	7/79
KS2054	WET WALNUT SUBWATERSHED NO. 5	7/79
KY2036	BANKLICK CREEK	4/74
KY2023	BIG MUDDY CREEK	9/62
KY2018	CANEY CREEK	4/61
KY2038	CHAMBERLAIN BRANCH	5/80
KY2010	DONALDSON CREEK	7/58
KY2021	EAST FORK OF POND RIVER	9/61
KY2030	FOX CREEK	8/66
KY2008	MUD RIVER	7/58
KY2037	NORTH FORK NOLIN RIVER	5/74
KY2009	OBION CREEK	7/58
KY2035	RED LICK CREEK	7/72
KY2033	SALT LICK CREEK	12/69
KY2027	SHORT CREEK	3/64
KY	STEWART CREET	5/82
KY2029	UPPER TRADEWATER RIVER	9/64
KY2032	WEST FORK OF MAYFIELD CREEK	4/69
KY2024	WEST FORK OF POND RIVER	10/62
LA2029	AVOYELLES-ST. LANDRY	3/72
LA2014	BAYOU BOEUF	10/65
LA2032	BAYOU BONNE IDEE	6/75
LA2037	BAYOU GROSSE TETE	9/76
LA2035	BAYOU PLAQUEMINE BRULE	11/75
LA	BELL CITY	5/82
LA2023	CAMERON-CREOLE	4/69
LA2024	CENTRAL MADISON	4/69
LA2026	CHATLIN LAKE CANAL	7/69
LA2038	CHOCTAW BAYOU	9/76
LA2018	COCODRIE-GRAND LOUIS	8/66
LA2019	CYPRESS-BLACK BAYOU	8/66
LA2017	DURALDE-DES CANNES	8/66
LA2033	EAST FRANKLIN	11/75
LA2036	JOHNSON BAYOU	9/76
LA2034	KINDER	11/75
LA2031	LAKE VERRET	2/73
LA2015	LOWER BAYOU TECHE	10/65
LA2002	UPPER BAYOU NEZPIQUE	8/57
LA2027	WALNUT-ROUNDAWAY	7/69
LA2030	WEST CARROLL	7/72
MA2001	BAITING BROOK	8/57
MA2010	CLAM RIVER	12/63
MA2014	DIAMOND BROOK	9/76
MA2004	SU-AS-CO	8/59
MA2007	UPPER QUABOAG RIVER	9/62
MA2012	WASHINGTON MOUNTAIN BROOK	4/69
MA2013	WEST BRANCH WESTFIELD RIVER	10/70

PROJECT	NAME	DATE
MD2017	DIVIDING CREEK	7/74
MD2013	GOLDSBORO	8/67
MD2018	SENECA CREEK	3/82
MD2016	ST. MARY'S RIVER	9/70
ME2011	LOVEJOY POND	7/81
ME	PARKHURST SIDING-CARIBOU	3/82
ME2002	PRESQUE ISLE STREAM	7/64
ME	SEBASTICOOK LAKE	4/82
MI2014	EAST BRANCH STURGEON RIVER	8/66
MI2017	EAST UPPER MAPLE RIVER	10/70
MI2019	INDIAN CREEK	3/75
MI2009	MIDDLE BRANCH OF CASS RIVER	3/64
MI2020	ROGUE RIVER	7/76
MI2018	WEST UPPER MAPLE RIVER	3/71
MN2016	BELLE CREEK	3/72
MN2018	CANBY CREEK	4/76
MN2013	LAKES OKABENA & OCHEDA	7/65
MN2017	NORMAN-POLK	11/75
MO2009	BEAR CREEK	4/64
MO2013	DURGENS CREEK	8/66
MO2002	EAST FORK OF BIG CREEK	1/59
MO2011	GRINDSTONE-LOST-MUDDY CREEK	9/65
MO2015	LITTLE SNI-A-BAR	4/69
MO2018	LOST CREEK	11/73
MO2020	LOWER LITTLE BLACK (ARK)	9/78
MO2007	SOUTH FORK OF BLACKWATER RIVER	7/62
MO2019	UPPER LITTLE BLACK	9/78
MO2012	WILLOW CREEK	8/66
MS2050	BAHALA CREEK	10/70
MS2037	BIG CREEK	4/69
MS2042	BROWNS CREEKS	4/69
MS2040	CHUNKY RIVER	4/69
MS2020	CHUQUATONCHEE CREEK	10/63
MS2053	DEER CREEK	9/76
MS2028	DRY CREEK	8/66
MS2029	HOLLIDAY CREEK	8/66
MS2047	LINE CREEK	5/70
MS2026	LONG CREEK	9/65
MS2052	MANTACHIE, BOGUE FALA AND BOGUE EUCUBA C	7/76
MS2003	MUDDY CREEK	7/58
MS2054	OKATOMA CREEK	9/78
MS2041	RICHLAND CREEK	4/69
MS2007	SECOND CREEK	9/59
MS2055	SHUQUALAK CREEK	9/78
MS2051	SOWASHEE CREEK	10/74
MS2024	STANDING PINE CREEK	8/65
MS2032	TALLAHAGA CREEK	8/66
MS2021	TOWN CREEK	3/64
MS2025	TUSCUMBIA RIVER	9/65
MS2045	UPPER LEAF RIVER	8/69
MT2008	BIG SPRING CREEK	5/70
MT2014	BOULDER RIVER	10/78
MT2013	CITY OF BROWNING	7/76

PROJECT	NAME	DATES
MT2009	NEWLAN CREEK	10/70
MT2015	WOLF CREEK	7/81
NC2042	BRYANT SWAMP	6/75
NC	BUFFALO-MUDDY FORK CREEK	5/82
NC2034	CHICOD CREEK	8/66
NC2046	COUNTRY LINE CREEK	6/76
NC2025	CRABTREE CREEK	9/64
NC2003	DEEP CREEK (YADKIN)	1/58
NC2035	DUTCHMAN CREEK	8/66
NC2031	JACOB SWAMP	6/66
NC2047	LIMESTONE CREEK	12/80
NC2036	LITTLE CONTENTNEA CREEK	8/66
NC2037	LITTLE YADKIN RIVER	8/66
NC2049	MOSS NECK	9/81
NC2048	MUDDY CREEK (DUPLIN)	12/80
NC2045	SECOND BROAD RIVER	6/76
NC2028	STEWARTS CREEK-LOVILLS CREEK	9/65
NC2039	SWIFT CREEK	12/69
NC2013	TOWN FORK CREEK	6/60
ND2013	BOUNDARY CREEK	8/66
ND2014	MIDDLE BRANCH-PARK RIVER	8/66
ND2008	MIDDLE-SOUTH BRANCH FOREST RIVER	8/61
ND2017	SQUARE BUTTE CREEK	5/70
ND2012	ST. THOMAS-LODEMA	8/65
ND2019	UPPER TURTLE RIVER	9/70
NE2040	AOWA CREEK	5/70
NE	BALLS BRANCH	5/82
NE2019	BELLWOOD	7/63
NE2017	BIG INDIAN CREEK	9/62
NE2047	BLACKWOOD CREEK	9/78
NE2049	BONE CREEK	12/81
NE2041	CLEAR CREEK	10/71
NE2028	COTTONWOOD CREEK	8/65
NE2016	GERING VALLEY	6/62
NE2046	LONG BRANCH	9/76
NE2039	LOWER MEDICINE CREEK	4/69
NE2048	MIDDLE FORK MAPLE CREEK	8/81
NE2006	OAK-MIDDLE CREEK TRIBUTARIES OF SALT CRE	7/56
NE2036	PAPILLION CREEK	4/69
NE2025	ROCK CREEK(PAWNEE)	5/65
NE2051	SOUTH BRANCH LITTLE NEMAHA	3/82
NE2045	SOUTH FORK	7/74
NE2026	SPRING CREEK (JOHNSON)	5/65
NE2050	STEVENS-CALLAHAN(CAMP CREEK)	3/82
NE2043	TEKAMAH-MUD CREEK	10/72
NE2030	UPPER BIG NEMAHA	10/65
NE2038	UPPER MEDICINE CREEK	4/69
NE2011	WILSON CREEK	4/60
NE2042	WINNEBAGO-BEAN CREEK	7/72
NE2044	WINTERS CREEK	4/74
NH2005	BAKER RIVER	3/64
NH2006	DEAD RIVER	8/66
NH2008	INDIAN BROOK	6/76

PROJECT	NAME	DATE
NH2003	SOUHEGAN RIVER	9/61
NH2007	SUGAR RIVER	10/72
NJ2010	ASSUNPINK CREEK	8/65
NJ2014	CLOVE BROOK	7/81
NJ2013	FURNACE BROOK	5/68
NM2018	AVALON-ALACRAN	8/64
NM2025	CORRALES	5/70
NM2028	COTTONWOOD-WALNUT CREEK	6/76
NM2021	CROW & BROAD CANYONS & PLACITAS ARROYO	8/66
NM2027	EAGLE-TUMBLEWEED DRAW	10/74
NM2030	ESPANOLA-RIO CHAMA	9/76
NM2023	SEBASTIAN MARTIN-BLACK MESA	12/69
NM2022	SIBLEY, GREEN, JARALOSA AND CANDLER ARRO	8/69
NM2026	T OR C WILLIAMSBURG ARROYOS	11/73
NM2029	ZUNI PUEBLO	6/76
NY2012	BATAVIA KILL	8/66
NY	BLIND BROOK (CT)	4/82
NY2021	BRANDYWINE CREEK	11/81
NY2002	CONEWANGO CREEK	4/60
NY2015	CROMLINE CREEK	2/75
NY2020	DEPOSIT CREEK	10/78
NY2018	FLINT CREEK	9/76
NY2016	HIGINBOTHAM BROOK	2/75
NY2003	ISCHUA CREEK	6/60
NY2019	MILL BROOK	9/76
NY2009	NANTICOKE CREEK	6/64
NY2014	NEWTOWN-HOFFMAN CREEKS	8/69
NY2017	OAK ORCHARD CREEK	9/76
OH2005	CHIPPEWA CREEK	6/60
OH2013	LITTLE AUGLAIZE RIVER	2/67
OH2014	MIDDLE BRANCH OF THE LITTLE AUGLAIZE RIV	2/67
OH2015	PRAIRIE-HOAGLIN BR. OF LITTLE AUGLAIZE R	2/67
OH2009	RUSH CREEK	3/64
OH2017	SHORT CREEK	10/78
OK2056	BRUSHY-PEACEABLE CREEK	5/70
OK2020	CANE CREEK	9/61
OK2026	CANEY CREEK	7/63
OK2047	COTTON-COON-MISSION CREEK	4/69
OK2061	COW CREEK	5/73
OK2059	DEEP RED RUN-COFFIN CREEK	6/71
OK2049	FITZGERALD AND SOLDIER CREEKS	4/69
OK2051	JACK CREEK	4/69
OK2060	KADASHAN BOTTOM	12/71
OK2065	KICKAPOO NATIONS	7/79
OK2012	LEADER-MIDDLE CLEAR BOGGY CREEK	8/60
OK2058	LOST-DUCK CREEKS	6/70
OK2034	LOWER BAYOU	6/64
OK2052	LOWER BLACK BEAR CREEK	4/69
OK2030	LOWER CLEAR BOGGY CREEK	3/64
OK2053	LOWER RED ROCK CREEK	4/69
OK2064	MCKINNEY BUZZARD	10/78
OK2054	OKFUSKEE TRIBUTARIES	4/69
OK2044	OTTER CREEK	8/66

PROJECT	NAME	DATE
OK2067	PAW PAW BOTTOMS	11/79
OK2062	POTT-SEM-TURKEY	7/76
OK2055	PRYOR CREEK	8/69
OK2039	QUAPAW CREEK	9/65
OK2066	ROBINSON CREEK	7/79
OK2009	SALT CREEK	3/59
OK2031	SALT-CAMP CREEK	3/64
OK2005	SANDY CREEK	8/57
OK2029	STILLWATER CREEK	10/63
OK2028	TRI-COUNTY TURKEY CREEK	8/63
OK2038	UNCLE JOHN CREEK	7/65
OK2033	UPPER BAYOU	6/64
OK2014	UPPER BLACK BEAR CREEK	8/60
OK2022	UPPER BLUE RIVER	10/62
OK2010	UPPER CLEAR BOGGY CREEK	9/59
OK2040	UPPER ELK CREEK	9/65
OK2063	UPPER MUDDY BOGGY CREEK	9/78
OK2018	UPPER RED ROCK CREEK	8/61
OK2027	WATERFALL-GILFORD CREEK	8/63
OR2011	GRAND PRAIRIE	7/70
OR2014	LITTLE LUCKIAMUTE RIVER	6/76
OR2008	LOWER AMAZON & FLAT CREEK	8/66
OR2010	NORTH POWDER RIVER	4/69
OR2015	ROCK CREEK	9/78
OR2009	WOLF CREEK	4/69
PA2012	BRANDYWINE CREEK	10/62
PA2015	BRIAR CREEK	12/63
PA2023	CROSS CREEK	10/74
PA2008	DUNLAP CREEK	9/61
PA2021	JACOBS CREEK	8/69
PA2002	LITTLE SCHUYLKILL RIVER	7/58
PA2014	LITTLE SHENANGO RIVER	12/63
PA2017	MIDDLE CREEK	10/65
PA2022	NESCOPECK CREEK	4/74
PA2020	NESHAMINY CREEK	10/67
PA2018	OIL CREEK	10/65
PR2001	ANASCO RIVER	9/62
PR2003	GUAYANES RIVER	10/63
SC2025	BROWN'S CREEK	4/69
SC2026	CANE CREEK	4/69
SC2036	CLARKS FORK-BULLOCKS CREEK	10/74
SC2037	FAIRFOREST CREEK	10/75
SC2033	HOLLOW CREEK	1/72
SC2028	LITTLE LYNCHES CREEK	4/69
SC2040	LITTLE RIVER	8/81
SC2029	NORTH TYGER RIVER	5/70
SC	NORTHEAST CALHOUN	3/82
SC2035	OOLENOY RIVER	5/73
SC2038	RABON CREEK	4/76
SC2031	ROCKY CREEK	9/70
SC2022	SOUTH TYGER RIVER	2/67
SC2015	THREE & TWENTY CREEK	9/64
SC2039	UPPER NEW RIVER	7/76

PROJECT	NAME	DATE
SD2006	BRULE CREEK	6/59
SD2012	SPRING-BULL CREEK	4/69
SD2015	UNION CREEK	7/72
TN2037	BOGOTA	9/75
TN2015	CANE CREEK	8/61
TN2029	CROW CREEK	8/66
TN2036	HURRICANE CREEK	5/74
TN2027	MARTIN CREEK	10/65
TN2038	MCNAIRY-CYPRESS CREEK	6/76
TN2022	MIDDLE FORK-OBION RIVER	10/63
TN2031	MUD CREEK	7/69
TN2039	NORTH FORK-FORKED DEER RIVER	10/80
TN2017	PINE CREEK	6/62
TN2010	PORTERS CREEK	4/60
TN2035	RED BOILING SPRINGS	5/74
TN2013	REELFOOT-INDIAN CREEK	6/60
TN2034	SWEETWATER CREEK	7/72
TN2023	WEATHERFORD-BEAR CREEK	10/63
TX2066	AQUILLA-HACKBERRY CREEK	4/69
TX2048	ATTOYAC BAYOU	7/65
TX2047	BIG CREEK	8/64
TX2023	CANEY CREEK	8/59
TX2019	CHILTIPIN-SAN FERNANDO CREEK	4/59
TX2052	CHOCOLATE, LITTLE CHOCOLATE, LYNN BAYOU	10/65
TX2055	CHOCTAW CREEK	10/66
TX2069	COMAL RIVER	5/70
TX2078	CORNUDAS, NORTH AND CULP DRAWS	4/74
TX2079	DEPORT CREEK	8/75
TX2050	DONAHOE CREEK	7/65
TX2074	ECLETO CREEK	6/71
TX2087	ELM CREEK (CEN-TEX)	6/76
TX2053	ESCONDIDO CREEK	10/65
TX2060	FARMERS CREEK	4/69
TX2092	HAMILTON CREEK	10/79
TX2077	HITSON, C&L AND WASHBURN DRAWS	4/74
TX2072	HOG CREEK	9/70
TX2038	KENT CREEK	8/62
TX2080	KICKAPOO CREEK (LIPAN)	11/75
TX2068	LAKEVIEW	8/69
TX2082	LEONA RIVER	4/76
TX2006	LOWER BRUSHY CREEK	6/56
TX2035	LOWER PLUM CREEK	6/61
TX2070	LOWER RUNNING WATER DRAW	5/70
TX2083	MCCLELLAN CREEK	4/76
TX2063	MILL CREEK	4/69
TX2057	NORTH CUERO	4/67
TX2084	PALUXY RIVER	4/76
TX2059	PECAN CREEK	4/69
TX2044	PINE CREEK	3/64
TX2029	PLUM CREEK	8/60
TX2088	POLLARD CREEK	7/76
TX2085	RED DEER CREEK	4/76
TX2071	RUNNING WATER DRAW	5/70

PROJECT	NAME	DATE
TX2056	RUSH CREEK	10/66
TX2040	SALADO CREEK	10/62
TX2020	SAN DIEGO-ROSITA CREEKS	4/59
TX2081	SAN FELIPE	4/76
TX2076	SANDERSON CANYON	6/71
TX2024	TEHUACANA CREEK	9/59
TX2090	THREE MILE AND SULFER DRAW	9/76
TX2007	UPPER BRUSHY CREEK	6/56
TX2073	UPPER CIBOLO CREEK	9/70
TX2017	UPPER LAKE FORK CREEK	7/58
TX2091	UPPER SAN MARCOS RIVER	7/79
TX2086	WILLOW CREEK	6/76
TX2011	YORK CREEK	1/58
UT2008	BLUE CREEK-HOWELL	7/61
UT2015	DRY GULCH-MARTIN LATERAL	7/81
UT2010	FERRON	9/65
UT2014	HANSEL VALLEY	6/75
UT2011	MONROE-ANNABELLA	3/66
UT2013	WARNER DRAW	12/69
VA2027	BUFFALO RIVER	10/74
VA2029	BUSH RIVER	10/78
VA2030	CEDAR RUN	10/78
VA2031	GREAT CREEK	10/78
VA2014	HORSE PASTURE CREEK	9/63
VA2010	LITTLE RIVER	12/61
VA2028	NIBBS CREEK	9/78
VA2023	POHICK CREEK	4/69
VA2022	SLATE RIVER	4/69
VA2016	SOUTH ANNA RIVER	4/65
VA2021	UPPER CLINCH VALLEY	4/69
VT2005	LAPLATTE RIVER	9/79
VT2006	LOWER OTTER AND DEAD CREEKS	9/81
VT2004	UPPER CASTLETON RIVER	5/74
WA2010	EAST SIDE GREEN RIVER	8/66
WA2015	JOHNSON CREEK	7/81
WA2005	MARSHLAND	8/59
WA2013	NEWMAN LAKE	6/75
WA2016	PLEASANT VALLEY CREEK	7/81
WI2007	BAD AXE	6/60
WI2014	GLEN HILLS	12/63
WI2026	PINE RIVER	10/78
WI2030	UPPER SUGAR RIVER	7/81
WI	UPPER WEST BRANCH OF THE PECATONICA	4/82
WI2012	WEST FORK KICKAPOO	9/61
WV2011	BIG DITCH RUN	9/63
WV2006	BRUSH CREEK	6/60
WV2019	DUNLOUP CREEK	7/69
WV2017	ELK TWOMILE CREEK	4/69
WV2013	HARMON CREEK	3/65
WV2021	MILL CREEK	6/71
WV	PINEY CREEK-SOAK CREEK	4/82
WV2024	POCATALICO RIVER BASIN	1/75
WV2020	POND RUN	5/70
WV2015	UPPER BUFFALO CREEK	8/66
WV2016	WHEELING CREEK	10/66
WY2010	COTTONWOOD CREEK	7/69
WY2012	SPRING CANYON	6/75
WY2008	STAR VALLEY-DRY CREEK	7/67
WY2009	UPPER NORTH LARAMIE RIVER	4/69

536 RECORDS PRINTED

Abdnor - How many of the structures to be constructed under plans for the four projects before the Subcommittee will have storage that could be utilized for recreation, but for which no public access is required? In each case, will the adjacent landowners have full access to the impoundment?

Crowell - In the Upper Mud and Mozingo Creek Watersheds there are no additional structures that would have storage that could be utilized for recreation. In the South Zumbro Watershed, the six single-purpose floodwater retarding structures will have water in the area of the pool allocated to sediment storage. This storage could be used for limited recreation until such time as sediment accumulation replaces the water. The sponsors of the project have the option of obtaining permanent easements or purchase the land required for these structures. If permanent easements are obtained the adjacent landowner would have full access to the temporary impoundment. If the land is purchased the sponsors would then have the right to exclude everyone.

In the Little Calumet project sites 53 and 143 have potential for recreation. The sponsors have elected to purchase the land required and, therefore, control ingress and egress. Therefore, adjacent landowners will not have full access to any potential impoundment.

Upper Mud River - West Virginia

Abdnor - I notice that, at 7-3/8% interest, this project will produce $429,000 in annual benefits for a cost of $421,000 yearly. Isn't that a rather narrow benefit-to-cost ratio, using a pretty low interest rate?

The Upper Mud River Report mentions that 28 households will have to be relocated. Has there been significant objections to the project from any of these households?

On p. 102 of the report, organizations invited to participate in planning are listed, and on p. 104 organizations invited to comment on the report are listed. Why were many of those organizations listed on p. 102 not invited to comment?

Crowell - The interest rate of 7-3/8% is the interest rate prescribed by law for a water resources plan developed at the time the Upper Mud River Watershed Plan was prepared. The rate was set by the Water Resources Council and cannot be changed to either a higher or lower rate by the Soil Conservation Service.

The benefits claimed for the purpose of the economic evaluation include only those benefits which would accrue within the watershed boundary. There are, in fact, additional flood damage reduction benefits which would accrue to residents outside the watershed in the communities of Milton and Barboursville. These benefits accrue to 280 homes, 18 businesses, 5 schools, a library, and a fire station, all of which were damaged during the storm of December 1978. Damage to public facilities from this storm was estimated to be $603,500. Structure 2A would control approximately 20 percent of the drainage area above Milton and would reduce flood damages from storms similar to the December 1978 storm; these, however, were not determined.

There have been no significant objections to the Upper Mud River Watershed project from any of those persons who will be relocated because of the project installation. Relocations will be handled in accord with the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970.

Planning on this watershed was multiobjective and comprehensive in nature. The purpose of inviting a broad cross section of the public and a large number of local, State, and Federal agencies to participate in project planning was to determine the nature and scope of the problems in the Upper Mud River Watershed and to determining potential solutions. This process is very important in doing a good comprehensive job of planning.

A number of the agencies and organizations originally invited to participate in the scoping and planning found that the project was not of interest to them. Still others contributed throughout the planning process and had full opportunity to incorporate their views in the project. Anyone who wished to do so was welcome to comment on the draft plan and environmental impact statement (plan-EIS). Those formally requested to do so were those whose comments are normally solicited as part of the distribution of any draft plan-EIS.

Little Calumet River, Illinois

Abdnor - The Director of the Illinois Division of Water Resources, Frank Kudrna, testified at the hearing that key sponsors have already acquired three of the four reservoir sites. What is this land being used for at present?

Crowell - The three sites already purchased by the sponsors and the present land use are: site 32, a vacant tract of land in the flood plain; site 53, also a vacant tract of land; and site 143, an abandoned sand and gravel pit and vacant tract of land. The fourth site, not purchased, is an active quarry.

Abdnor - Can you provide a breakdown by where the estimated 123,400 annual visitors will come from? Do or will public transportation routes exist to take people to and from structure 32?

Crowell - The majority of the annual visitors to the recreation site 32 will come from the Tinley Park area (1980 population of 26,000). The 123,400 figure represents annual visitor days. Residents closer to the facilities would be expected to visit more than once a year. Within a 5-mile radius there is a population of 90,000 people. Public transportation routes exist to the area of the proposed facility. The facility is relatively small in scope with parking facilities for only 50 vehicles encouraging other means of transportation to the park area.

Abdnor - Is there potential for recreational development on or around structures 53, 84, and 143? What is the socio-economic and racial composition of the population surrounding these reservoirs as well as the structure to be used for recreation?

Crowell - There would be potential for recreation at sites 53 and 143, but not at site 84 where there is an abandoned sand and gravel pit. From a socio-economic study using 1977 data for 200 Chicago suburban areas, the socio-economic profile at the possible recreation sites are: site 53, consisting of two communities, Markum and Harvey, ranked 183 and 195 respectively; site 143, consisting of Sauk Village and East Chicago Heights, ranked 123 and 200 respectively. Information for the community of Lynwood in the vicinity of site 143, was not available. Tinley Park, in the vicinity of site 32, ranked 152. The racial composition around site 53 (1980 census) is: Black - 67%; White - 31%; Other - 27%. Around site 143 it is: Black - 27%; White - 71%; Other - 2%. Around site 32 it is: Black - 2%; White - 96%; Other - 2%.

Abdnor - Are there any landfills, hazardous waste disposal sites, sewage treatment lagoons, etc., in the vicinity of any of the structures? If so, will ground water pumpage accelerate or alter the flow of any leachate from these sites?

Crowell - There are no known landfills or other types of potential ground water hazards in the vicinity of the structures.

Mozingo Creek, Missouri

Abdnor - Page P-9 of the Mozingo report states that $2.25 per recreation visit was used to estimate total annual recreation benefits. Is this the same figure used in estimating the recreation benefits of the Little Calumet Watershed Plan and the South Zumbro Watershed Plan? If not, please explain?

Crowell - While $2.25 per recreation visit was used for Mozingo Creek, a value of $1.50 was used for the Little Calumet project. A lower value was used because of the lower intensity of recreation development and fewer recreation opportunities available. A value of $2.25 was used in the South Zumbro project.

Abdnor - At the hearing, Father Alphonse Sitzmann stated that there have been instances of "blue" babies caused by excess nitrates in the water sources surrounding Maryville. Is this correct and if so, will the Mozingo project eliminate this problem?

Crowell - A death of a baby living in Conception, Missouri, occurred last month. Conception is located 12 miles southeast of Maryville. Cause of death was attributed to nitrate. Tests conducted by the Missouri State Health Department have shown about 20 shallow wells in the area have exceeded the nitrate standard of 10 ppm (test results ranged from 10 to 70 ppm). These wells, drilled by farmers for individual use, are showing increased nitrate concentration over the last few years. In addition, about 50% of rural farm wells exceed the coliform standard. This problem should be eliminated as rural water districts are formed to use water stored by the project, thus, eliminating the need for individual wells. This water will be treated before being delivered to the rural farm communities.

South Zumbro River, Minnesota

Abdnor - How would the SCS project stand, if the Corps project did not go forward? Would the stated benefits of the SCS project be increased or lessened? If the Corps project goes ahead, what effect would that have on the benefits of the SCS project?

Crowell - If the Corps of Engineers' project did not go forward, the SCS project would stand favorably with a benefit to cost ratio of 2.4 to 1.0. However, there would still be damages remaining of $3.4 million. With both projects in place the remaining damages will be $108,000. Without the Corps participation benefits to the SCS project would be increased as the project would pick up benefits prorated to the Corps project. If the Corps does go ahead there would be no change in benefits to the SCS project as displayed in the plan.

Abdnor - Page E-69 mentions that there will probably be a decrease in the numbers of species in the streams below the reservoirs. Which species? Will any of those species be the recreation species mentioned on p. E-52? If so, were the costs of the probable loss of this fishery taken into account in benefit-cost calculations.

Crowell - The reference to a decrease in species refers to a reduction of the invertebrate species identified in the first sentence of the second paragraph and not fish species. There is not expected to be a decrease in fish species composition as stated further in the second paragraph.

Abdnor - What are your views on the statement by Edward R. Osann representing the National Wildlife Federation?

Crowell - I will discuss Mr. Osann's three areas of comment separately.

1. The Small Watershed Program does little to reduce soil erosion.

We assume Mr. Osann's reference to "main mission" refers to the findings of our study in response to the testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. This was a report on the findings of our study in response to the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act of 1977 (RCA). We identified soil erosion as our highest priority for addressing problems associated with soil, water, and related resources over the next 5 years. We also identified reduction of flood damages in upstream areas as our next highest priority.

Our RCA studies show that more than 175 million acres of nonfederal lands are subject to flooding. In 1975, upstream flood damages exceeded $1.6 billion.

There are numerous programs administered by the Department of Agriculture which deal with erosion and sediment. The Small Watershed Program (Public Law 83-566) is the only one dealing with flood protection. This program is giving increased emphasis to watershed protection through increased cost-share assistance for needed land treatment measures. Watershed protection includes measures for reducing erosion and sediment.

2. SCS cost-sharing requirements should be consistent with those of other Federal water development agencies.

The legislative authority for small watershed projects (PL 83-566) requires that any part of the construction cost applicable to flood prevention be borne by the Federal Government [§4(2)(B)]. In addition, PL 83-566 requires sponsoring local organizations to secure all land and water rights and to operate and maintain all structural measures. If these costs are included, sponsors of small watershed projects will, in most cases, exceed the recent requirement for sponsors to pay 35 percent of construction cost for Corps of Engineers projects. We believe a thorough review of the record of small watershed projects will show that Local interests have always had more involvement in the development of plans and carrying out the construction than is the case for other Federal water resource programs.

3. Fish and wildlife mitigation is needed for the Upper Mud River Watershed project.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recommendations called for leaving timber in selected coves of the upper end of the lake, preserving shoreline vegetation to the maximum extent practicable, and leaving small islands in backwater areas for waterfowl, in addition to the noted recommendation for purchasing land to be held in public ownership and managed for fish and wildlife. All of the recommendations were accepted by the sponsors and made a part of the plan except the purchase recommendation.

As stated on pages E 107-108 of the Project Watershed Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, all of the recommendations were considered but the sponsors did not feel that additional public land ownership in the watershed was in the best interest of the public. Public Law 85-624, known as the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, amended PL 83-566 by adding section 12 which states that a small watershed plan shall include recommendations by the Secretary of the Interior which are acceptable to the local organization and the Secretary of Agriculture (Sec. 12(2)). The acceptability clause is in recognition of the difference in PL 83-566 projects and other Federal projects in that Fish and Wildlife Service recommendations related to purchase of land would be totally sponsor responsibility.

Abdnor - I notice from the material that your office has provided to this Subcommittee that the Public Law 566 program has dwindled badly over the past several years. For example, construction spending, in constant dollars, is down by about 30 percent from the late 1960's. The number of projects under construction this year is down by over 10 percent from recent years. The number of new project applications has dropped by as much as 90 percent from a few years ago. I have two questions:

First, do you see a possible reversal?

Second, what is USDA doing in regard to new cost-sharing proposals, such as those proposed for a number of Corps of Engineers projects?

Crowell - The amount of funds for construction is a determination by the Administration and Congress. It is difficult to predict when, but we believe the economy will withstand increased Federal expenditures for flood prevention and other water and related land resource improvement at such time as inflation and interest rates moderate. The number of projects under construction should not increase since we have made concerted efforts to complete old projects. There could be a temporary increase if sevesal new projects are authorized at one time from the current backlog.

USDA is a member of the Cabinet Council on Natural Resources and Environment which is presently developing the Administration's cost-share proposals. We will follow the new cost-share proposals to the extent they are not precluded by PL 566 legislation.

Abdnor - I am giving you a copy of a letter that was written last year to Chairman Stafford by Secretary Block discussing S. 423, a bill intended to "improve the operations" of the P.L. 566 program. I will ask that this letter be included in our hearing record, and that the Department review the letter to see if it has any updated views, particularly in view of some of the Administration's new positions of project cost-sharing.

Crowell - We have reviewed our earlier response to Senator Stafford on S. 423. We see no conflict with current thinking and do not have any reason for change

Abdnor - Please provide us with a State-by-State list of the cumulative Federal obligations under the P.L. 566 program, as well as a State-by-State list of the active project costs, as of the most recent date available.

Crowell - The information through fiscal year 1981 is as follows:

ST	OBLIG	REM FED
AL	41,893,304	26,373,011
AR	88,270,608	38,583,333
AZ	50,245,459	74,450,417
CA	98,217,529	33,839,365
CO	24,237,929	10,352,640
CT	28,211,032	14,328,126
DE	16,553,314	10,165,226
FL	19,626,884	10,363,249
GA	64,190,926	31,323,717
HI	13,202,585	11,453,709
IA	53,909,310	38,429,899
ID	7,813,111	1,777,239
IL	46,590,664	21,333,439
IN	51,955,263	19,595,870
KS	93,726,350	47,795,427
KY	53,931,282	18,436,961
LA	64,928,014	66,842,465
MA	20,699,644	9,698,370
MD	15,443,202	2,640,506
ME	8,039,548	3,526,928
MI	11,880,184	10,323,950
MN	15,924,321	3,703,703
MO	27,268,932	43,588,024
MS	68,506,350	43,518,148
MT	14,153,460	13,360,668
NC	37,876,459	22,419,582
ND	25,759,706	14,740,148
NE	51,319,157	33,465,803
NH	15,100,112	7,187,409
NJ	24,378,961	12,486,785
NM	43,616,764	70,882,107
NV	2,716,250	1,223,197
NY	29,580,126	23,143,624
OH	37,313,213	6,955,607
OK	138,446,795	174,968,789
OR	20,622,855	44,992,003
PA	48,404,652	46,589,236
PR	3,913,791	23,703,860
SC	30,929,076	12,237,303
SD	7,151,807	1,911,822
TN	50,010,868	31,207,834
TX	174,566,523	105,156,375
UT	27,381,203	2,537,814
VA	26,733,983	23,993,648
VT	4,503,161	4,010,677
WA	22,484,506	12,866,624
WI	25,803,694	25,023,493
WV	42,160,407	16,144,159
WY	6,858,059	918,924
TOT	1,897,051,333	1,324,571,213

1,176 RECORDS TOTALED

1. For each of the 50 states, please list the following information:

    - The number of small watershed projects completed since the inception of the P.L. 566 program.
    - The number of P.L. 566 projects now under construction.
    - The number of P.L. 566 projects currently authorized, but on which construction has not begun.
    - The number of P.L. 566 projects currently under active study by the SCS.

STATE	COMPLETED	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	AUTHORIZED, CONSTRUCTION NOT BEGUN	UNDER ACTIVE STUDY
Alaska	--	--	--	--
Alabama	13	9	6	2
Arizona	5	4	1	3
Arkansas	28	14	9	5
California	11	8	2	2
Colorado	13	4	--	1
Connecticut	5	4	1	3
Delaware	1	3	--	1
Florida	11	5	2	1
Georgia	28	23	7	1
Hawaii	5	2	1	1
Idaho	2	3	3	9
Illinois	7	7	2	2
Indiana	12	17	4	2
Iowa	26	14	--	4
Kansas	23	20	8	7
Kentucky	12	15	5	--
Louisiana	16	17	5	5
Maine	5	1	3	--
Maryland	13	4	1	3
Massachusetts	3	5	1	1
Michigan	9	5	1	--
Minnesota	11	5	--	3
Mississippi	17	18	9	5
Missouri	9	10	--	6
Montana	8	2	3	2
Nebraska	18	20	6	5
Nevada	4	--	1	--
New Hampshire	2	4	1	--
New Jersey	10	2	1	1
New Mexico	16	6	5	1
New York	6	11	2	1
North Carolina	22	12	6	2
North Dakota	9	7	2	1
Ohio	5	5	4	4
Oklahoma	19	35	4	11
Oregon	6	3	4	4
Pennsylvania	10	11	2	4
Puerto Rico	--	1	1	--
Rhode Island	--	--	--	--
South Carolina	18	10	6	1
South Dakota	5	3	1	1
Tennessee	11	15	9	1
Texas	32	42	11	6
Utah	6	5	1	3
Vermont	1	--	4	1
Virginia	18	7	5	1
Washington	6	4	4	1
West Virginia	10	9	3	5
Wisconsin	13	8	3	1
Wyoming	8	3	1	1
TOTALS	548	442	162	125

2. What is the Federal cost, at today's prices, to complete all P.L. 566 projects currently authorized (this would include both the remaining costs of projects partially completed as well as the full cost of projects not yet initiated)?

   $1.3 billion

3. Please list the actual P.L. 566 construction appropriations during each of the past 15 years.

   (see answer to No. 4)

4. Please list the P.L. 566 construction appropriations (in constant dollars) for each of the past 15 years.

Fiscal Year	Actual Appropriation ($ Million)	Appropriation in constant (1981) Dollars ($ Million)
1965	$71	$258
1966	66	230
1967	70	231
1968	70	214
1969	58	160
1970	66	168
1971	78	175
1972	105	213
1973	106	197
1974	111	195
1975	130	165
1976	121	177
Transition Quarter	32	47
1977	122	167
1978	133	169
1979	136	160
1980	137	150
1981	159	159 (base year)
1982	159	not applicable

5. Please provide the number of projects under construction during each of the past 15 years, together with the number of projects completed during each of those years.

FISCAL YEAR	UNDER CONSTRUCTION	COMPLETED
1965	350	17
1966	367	32
1967	401	44
1968	412	46
1969	428	33
1970	429	35
1971	439	32
1972	436	25
1973	445	23
1974	449	23
1975	473	17
1976	463	29
1977	436	24
1978	436	24
1979	420	24
1980	424	11
1981	423	19
1982 (estimated)	400	23

6. How many applications for projects have occurred annually over the past decade? What trend, if any, appears to exist in non-Federal interest?

FISCAL YEAR	APPLICATIONS RECEIVED
1954	195
1955	220
1956	192
1957	191
1958	212
1959	211
1960	186
1961	217
1962	195
1963	224
1964	192
1965	183
1966	174
1967	148
1968	122
1969	133
1970	98
1971	55
1972	44
1973	32
1974	19
1975	21
1976	25
1977	10
1978	13
1979	26
1980	23
1981	40
1982	27

7. Please discuss how the SCS develops priorities for its construction work.

Until recently, it has not been necessary to prioritize construction work. Project applications and new planning starts were screened carefully to give precedence to high priority resource problems, generally flood prevention or agricultural water management. Appropriations were generally available at about the rate the sponsors had obtained landrights and had made arrangements for local financing. Presently, projects are becoming ready for construction at a rate faster than we can provide Federal financing; the inflation of construction costs has reduced the number of contracts we can undertake with a relatively constant appropriations level. When this occurs a number of factors are considered in prioritizing construction work. Highest priority is given to projects which have flood prevention or water management as their primary purpose. We also consider expenditures already incurred by sponsors, dates when landrights may begin to expire, severity of problem, and geographic distribution of projects. We also give precedence to contracts that will result in project completions. If all else is equal, we fund contracts in the order they become ready.

8. Do you anticipate more SCS projects being sent to Congress in the near future? What are they?

There are currently eight projects in OMB which could be forwarded for congressional approval.

Five projects would go to the Public Works Committees. They are:

Brundage Watershed, Idaho
Elk Creek Watershed, Kansas
South Fork Licking River Watershed, Ohio
Calapooya Watershed, Oregon
Los Olmas Creek Watershed, Texas

Three projects would go to the Agriculture Committees. They are:

Tehachapi Watershed, California
East Carroll Watershed, Louisiana
Hoyle Creek Watershed, Oklahoma

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

June [illegible]

Honorable Robert T. Stafford
Chairman, Committee on Environment
and Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We have reviewed S.423, a bill "To improve the operations of certain water resource projects submitted to the committees on public works of the Congress." In your letter dated April 30, 1981, you specifically requested our views on Section 2 of the bill which would require that at least 20 percent of the benefits from new small watershed projects be directly related to agriculture.

We do not favor enactment of such a provision. We believe that the benefits of the small watershed program, when viewed as a whole, accrue predominantly to rural areas. However, we would point out that rural areas are quite diverse and that they include many activities that are not necessarily directly related to agriculture. In addition to providing flood protection to crops, livestock, and farmsteads, watershed projects also protect small rural communities, homes, schools, businesses, roads and bridges. Projects also provide watershed protection benefits, water supply, recreation, wildlife and other natural resource related benefits.

We do not believe it would be in the best interest of the general public nor of rural communities, including agricultural producers, to arbitrarily require that a certain amount of the benefits must be directly related to agriculture. All projects costing more than $1,000,000 (currently about 80% of all projects) must be reviewed by the appropriate congressional committees. We believe this process provides Congress with the proper opportunity to judge small watershed projects on their own merits. This is preferable to an arbitrary limit on distribution of benefits.

We would also like to take this opportunity to comment on the other provisions of S.423. First, Section 1 of the bill would require all projects costing more than $10,000,000 to be approved by act of Congress. Presently such projects which include no structure with more than 4,000 acre-feet of capacity can be approved by resolution of the agriculture committees in the House and Senate. If the project includes a structure with more than 4,000 acre-feet it can be approved by resolutions of the public works committees. This system has been in effect since enactment of the original Act in 1954. It works well. We see no reason to require that these small watershed projects be authorized by an act of Congress. This would only add delay and expense to an already long and expensive process.

Honorable Robert T. Stafford

Section 3 of S.423 would require a study and report on the desirability of requiring full public access to all water impoundments that have a recreation related potential. We believe this study and report are not needed and would, therefore, be an unnecessary use of Federal personnel and funds.

Any impoundment under this program for which Federal funds are used to secure landrights or cost share for recreation facilities or where incidental recreation benefits are claimed must be open to the public under current regulation. Many small watershed projects do include recreation and are open to the public, thus, assuring that the recreation benefits anticipated are available to the general public.

Some sites are not suitable for development of public recreation or are considered too costly to develop. In such cases an easement may be secured for construction and for inspection of the structure. Ownership may remain in private control. These projects are federally assisted rather than federally controlled. We, therefore, do not believe it proper for the Federal Government to require a private owner to open his or her land to the public for use of a facility which may have some recreation potential but which does not include recreation as a part of the plan developed by local sponsoring organizations.

We do not believe lack of public access to small watershed structures is a problem which merits a Federal study and report to Congress.

Sincerely,

John R Block

John R. Block
Secretary

P.L. 83-566 PROJECTS
CUMULATIVE FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS
THROUGH 9/30/80

AL	42,499,310
AZ	35,035,551
AR	83,436,167
CA	93,225,650
CO	22,289,840
CN	20,053,719
DE	11,007,281
FL	18,465,314
GA	62,324,899
HA	12,478,923
ID	7,228,030
IL	46,016,179
IN	47,970,438
IA	49,828,259
KS	88,042,962
KY	51,610,457
LA	57,553,268
ME	6,838,911
MD	19,023,372
MA	20,761,142
MI	11,741,715
MN	15,153,944
MS	59,865,046
MO	27,498,860
MT	14,060,355
NE	47,052,583
NV	2,716,250
NH	15,258,703
NJ	23,597,072
NM	36,865,751
NY	27,011,573
NC	36,914,310
ND	24,083,307
OH	36,071,607
OK	129,163,027
OR	21,261,204
PA	53,430,529
PR	4,022,620
SC	24,507,967
SD	7,244,314
TN	48,046,998
TX	157,995,726
UT	27,008,727
VT	3,881,098
VA	24,957,853
WA	21,463,253
WV	30,977,210
WI	24,799,996
WY	6,780,195
TOTAL STATES	1,752,386,749

P.L.566 ACTIVE PROJECT COSTS AS OF 9/30/80

ST	FED COST	COST TO COMP
AL	74,179,644	55,215,687
AR	90,348,459	42,874,656
AZ	63,028,830	51,732,094
CA	128,001,733	71,120,154
CO	20,712,839	13,153,735
CT	24,680,000	10,100,761
DE	26,591,528	13,082,994
FL	19,919,900	9,202,267
GA	48,597,539	18,980,096
HI	12,814,196	9,984,833
IA	34,899,711	5,368,074
ID	6,561,777	232,958
IL	62,159,682	21,579,445
IN	54,104,437	19,375,422
KS	89,686,497	49,776,137
KY	62,897,213	23,422,395
LA	97,042,114	56,824,451
MA	27,821,471	10,139,795
MD	6,958,335	2,376,005
ME	4,763,454	2,540,168
MI	17,328,842	11,121,364
MN	11,533,268	5,359,689
MO	39,451,108	26,081,803
MS	76,038,926	37,577,829
MT	21,597,622	11,330,706
NC	52,034,410	31,235,415
ND	14,897,349	164,211
NE	46,291,345	13,627,146
NH	20,228,482	7,829,908
NJ	25,666,443	7,896,792
NM	77,671,518	62,884,190
NY	34,325,200	14,634,413
OH	36,716,620	11,424,894
OK	192,196,607	107,672,798
OR	48,682,392	37,687,363
PA	57,177,660	28,401,818
PR	24,009,300	20,162,506
SC	27,883,800	15,482,044
SD	4,301,332	1,140,533
TN	46,627,181	11,337,853
TX	156,241,207	47,323,065
UT	21,298,445	2,427,778
VA	28,617,468	19,520,350
VT	2,924,091	1,959,712
WA	26,640,000	16,416,204
WI	27,000,022	16,258,874
WV	52,872,817	20,444,993
WY	3,435,458	562,939
FINAL	2,149,458,272	1,075,049,317

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION
1412 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 202—797-6800

STATEMENT OF EDWARD R. OSANN
REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS
June 11, 1982

My name is Edward Osann. I am the Director of the National Wildlife Federation's Water Resources Program. The Federation, with over 4.2 million members and supporters and affiliate organizations in all 50 states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, is the nation's largest conservation organization. We appreciate the opportunity to testify on the proposed authorization of the four Soil Conservation Service Small Watershed plans before the subcommittee. We will address the role of the Small Watershed Program in soil erosion protection, examine the flood control cost-sharing requirements of the program, and then specifically comment on the Upper Mud River Watershed plan.

The Small Watershed Program does little to reduce soil erosion

As the result of an ongoing review of P.L. 83-566 Small Watershed projects, we have become increasingly concerned about the priorities of this important program. Relatively few of the dollars spent on small watershed projects lead to major soil erosion or sedimentation reductions. Instead, the SCS pays for flood control dams, stream channelization projects, and wetlands drainage projects. These projects generally do little to reduce soil erosion and frequently consume scarce wildlife habitat. We believe that the SCS should turn away from its environment-altering emphasis and move toward its main mission of reducing soil erosion. The four plans before you today unfortunately illustrate this trend, concentrating primarily on flood control, municipal water supply, and recreation. At a time when soil erosion rates exceed replacement levels on at least one-third of America's cropland, soil conservation should once again become the primary purpose of the Soil Conservation Service and its operations.

SCS cost-sharing requirements should be consistent with those of other Federal water development agencies.

Small Watershed projects and Army Corps of Engineers projects are similar in that they both tend to emphasize structural solutions to local flooding problems, rather than stressing flood warning systems, flood-proofing, or other less environmentally disruptive non-structural measures. Yet the cost-sharing requirements for the SCS Small Watershed projects differ from the Corps' cost-sharing requirements.

In particular, SCS projects, including the four presented to the subcommittee today, contain cost-sharing provisions that are highly favorable in comparison to the latest policy of the Department of the Army. The National Wildlife Federation believes that no constructive purpose is served by wide disparities in cost-sharing requirements between similar federal programs.

In its latest request for funding nine new water projects, the Corps has established its current cost-sharing requirements for local project sponsors at 35% of the costs allocated to flood control. In contrast, as the chart below indicates, the four

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

SCS projects before the subcommittee require a smaller local cost-share for the flood control features of each project.

Watershed Project	% Non-Federal Financing for Flood Control
Upper Mud River, WV	21%
Little Calumet River, IL	23%
Mozingo Creek, MO	4%
South Zumbro, MN	18%

With these lower cost-sharing requirements, the SCS is inexcusably encouraging local sponsors to build more costly dams and channelization projects. We believe that federal incentives for building flood control dams should be decreased and, at the very least, should be equal between the federal water resource development agencies.

Fish and wildlife mitigation is needed for the Upper Mud River Watershed project.

The West Virginia Wildlife Federation, along with the National Wildlife Federation, objects to the authorization of the Upper Mud River Watershed plan without the concurrent authorization of mitigation for anticipated fish and wildlife habitat losses. During its review of the plan, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recommended purchasing land to be managed specifically for fish and wildlife, but the SCS rejected their suggestion and failed to include a mitigation plan in the final watershed plan. We urge the subcommittee to not authorize the Upper Mud River Watershed plan until an adequate plan for acquiring fish and wildlife management land is developed, costed out, and approved by local sponsors. Thank you for the opportunity to present our testimony today.

UPPER MUD RIVER WATERSHED ASSOC
June 22, 1982

Senate Subcommittee on Public Works and the Environment:

Committee Members,

This letter is in regards to the proposed small watershed project on the Upper Mud River in Lincoln Co., WVa. The Upper Mud River Watershed Assoc. is a bi-partisan group elected to represent the sponsoring units of government during the planning and implementation phases of the project. Since our involvement began in 1970 we have studied in detail the problems associated with flooding on the Upper Mud River, and around Hamlin, the county seat of Lincoln Co.

This watershed project will control 92% of the flooding during an expected 100 year frequency storm. The direct and indirect benifits will have a more profound affect on this county than any other concieveable measure. The benifits of flood control and basic recreation will extend to neighboring counties as has been well documented during the planning and review phases of the project.

Public support has been outstanding since the project began. In February of 1974 the county passed a $344,232. levy by a vote of 70%. This money is earmarked for the project and has been accumulating interest until it is now nearly $500,000. The Boone County commission has verbally promised $500,000.to the project. In addition Logan and Cabell Counties are very enthused over increased flood control and recreation. The general public is still very hopeful that this project will reach completion so that all of the many problems associated with widespread flooding can be put aside to allow citizens to pursue a less troubled and more prosperous life.

We sincerely wish that you will give this project favorable consideration. In today's economy, the Federal government's share of this very worthwile project will be a small price to pay for such far reaching benifits.

Enclosed are pictures of flooding on the Upper Mud River.

Sincerely;

C.E. Monday

C.E. Monday
President, Upper Mud River Watershed Association

Encl.

ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANK GIGLIO
STATE REPRESENTATIVE

SPRINGFIELD OFFICE
2111 STRATTON BUILDING
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62706
217/782-8077

30th DISTRICT OFFICE
685 WENTWORTH
CALUMET CITY, ILLINOIS 60409
312/891-8181

STATEMENT TO THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS CONCERNING THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER WATERSHED FLOODWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN.

As elected Representatives of State legislative districts around the Little Calumet River, we urge you to adopt, without further delay, a resolution ordering the Department of Agriculture to proceed with plans for a floodwater management plan for our area.

It is essential to the residents of the many communities around the Little Calumet River that this project begin as soon as possible to prevent any additional damage or loss of property from flooding.

Floods in our area in 1979 and 1980 damaged many thousands of homes and businesses along the river. As recently as this past spring, flood waters further damaged personal property and resulted in the loss of tons of rich Illinois topsoil through sedimentation and erosion.

The proposed Little Calumet River Watershed Floodwater Management Plan is being developed jointly by the Soil Conservation Service and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. The plan, when completed, would reduce flood damage in the area of 98 percent.

An estimated 6,615 homes and virtually all businesses in the floodplain would be protected with improvements in the land surrounding the river. In addition, some 52,700 tons of sediment would be prevented from entering streams each year.

With the implementation of this plan the area surrounding the river, that area commonly referred to as the 100-year floodplain, would shrink from 10,800 acres to 4,900 acres.

The plan, as proposed, would involve creation of four reservoirs, improvement of the Calumet Union Drainage Ditch, flood-proofing programs and maintenance of the Calumet Union Channel.

This is a multi-million dollar project, but one which will be shared by the Metropolitan Sanitary District, the Calumet-Union Drainage District, Cook County and the state and federal governments.

Federal financial aid, if approved, will come to the project through the Soil Conservation Service.

This proposal was first submitted to the federal government for approval in March 1979.

It has earned the approval of the Office of Management and Budget and is now awaiting direction from the legislative bodies.

Time is of the Essence. The designs must be completed and bids let before construction can begin. And construction of this magnitude will take time. It is the desire of the residents of our districts that this project be accomplished before another season of rain begins.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this matter. Together, and with hard work, we are convinced that we will be able to get this project moving. This will ensure a better place for the citizens of our districts to work, to live and to raise our children.

Frank Giglio

STATE REPRESENTATIVE FRANK GIGLIO
DEMOCRAT, CALUMET CITY

Richard F Kelly

STATE REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD KELLY
DEMOCRAT, HAZELCREST

LETTERS REGARDING THE MOZINGO CREEK PROJECT

Mr. Chairman:

For the last eight years, I have represented the 3rd District of Illinois. During this time, we have suffered two major devastating floods, one of which caused President Reagan to declare our area a national disaster. For this reason, I want to indicate my support for the authorization of the Little Calumet Watershed Flood Control Project.

I realize that this is not the total solution; the Deep Tunnel Project and the upgrading of the local sewer system are still major necessities. But it is the first step in a comprehensive program to eliminate our serious flood problems. The Office of Management and Budget has approved this plan, and thus, through them the President has indicated he is in favor of the project. The federal, state, and local Illinois officials have all supported this project since its conception. No major obstacle lies in its path. All that is needed is funding from the federal government.

I hope that the Senate will realize the urgency of this matter. We, in Illinois, have been working on this legislation for many years, for we realize that any large rainfall could cause a repetition of the violent flooding that has plagued our community. This project is of great importance to the citizens of northern Illinois. I urge that my colleagues in the Senate work together to support this legislation

Marty Russo

MARTY RUSSO, M.C.

Testimony by

The Honorable Christopher S. Bond

Governor of Missouri

MOZINGO CREEK WATERSHED

Presented to the Subcommittee on Water Resources June 11, 1982

The State of Missouri strongly supports funding for the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project. The multi-purpose reservoir and four grade stabilization structures will protect 19,415 acres of land from flooding and soil erosion. The project will create adequate supplies of water and recreation for an area of the state where these resources are badly needed.

Missouri is currently losing soil at an estimated rate of 11.4 tons per acre. Only two other states are faced with such severe soil erosion problems. The cropland alone in the Mozingo Creek Watershed is losing soil at an estimated fifteen tons per acre. Recent extensive rainfall in Missouri has further emphasized the soil erosion problems for the Mozingo Watershed area. Flood prevention benefits will include reductions in erosion and sediment damages. Other related flood prevention benefits consist of reductions in floodwater damages to crops, pastures, fences, roads, and bridges.

Accelerated conservation land treatment measures will be applied by landowners throughout the watershed with the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service, the U.S. Forest Service through the Missouri Department of

Conservation, the Department of Natural Resources' Soil and Water Program and the financial assistance of federal and/or state programs. Areas to be adequately treated and protected during the project installation period include 3,145 acres of cropland, 2,228 acres of pastureland, 240 acres of forest and 1,949 acres of recreation land. An additional 1,150 acres of cropland and 1,098 acres of pastureland will be adequately treated and protected under the ongoing conservation program. These land treatment measures will be applied to reduce soil erosion, provide stabilization and improve land and environmental quality in the watershed. Cooperators with the Soil and Water Conservaiton District will be assisted in developing resource conservation plans for the orderly application of land treatment measures. As a part of the accelerated land treatment program, 424,500 feet of terraces, 14,600 feet of diversions, 55 acres of grassed waterways, 340 acres of pasture and hayland and 64 grade stabilization structures will be installed and cost-shared with PL-566 funds.

Fewer farm owners with larger holdings has been the trend in Missouri in recent years. If this trend continues a need for off-farm employment will dramatically increase. Projected industrial growth in the area reflects a thirty percent rise in water needs for industry alone over the next fifty years.

Over three hundred thousand persons live within a one hour drive of the proposed reservoir. Des Moines, Iowa; Omaha, Nebraska; Topeka, Kansas; and Kansas City, Missouri, are all within a three hour drive. There are currently no public recreation facilities in the watershed. The one thousand acre lake is estimated to provide for four hundred thousand recreation visits annually. Recreational activities will include camping, picnicking, hiking, swimming and warm-water fishing.

The City of Maryville located near the proposed project has already passed a four million dollar bond issue to cover the costs of improvements to roads and other public facilities associated with the fourteen million dollar project. The city will also pay for operation, maintenance, and replacement of the embankment, spillways, reservoir area, boundary fence and wildlife habitat plantings. Maintenance of the raw water line and intake structure will also be the responsibility of Maryville. The Mozingo Creek watershed subdistrict will contribute to the maintenance of the grade-stabilization structures. These contributions reflect strong local support for this project.

The State of Missouri stands ready to assist in the development of the recreational benefits and the conservation land treatment measures associated with the project.

Thank you for your consideration of this much needed and strongly supported multi-purpose water project.

CHARLES R. BELL
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MARYVILLE, MISSOURI 64468

TELEPHONE (816) 582-4741

June 2, 1982

Mr. James Abdnor
Mozingo Creek Watershed Project Hearing
Water Resources Subcommittee
4204 Dirksen Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Abdnor:

As a lifetime resident of Maryville, Nodaway County, Missouri, I wish to state my interest in the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project.

This project would not only help with water and soil conservation, but would provide a much needed water supply for the City of Maryville and the Rural Water Districts of the county. At present, we depend solely upon a small river which in years of drought does not provide enough water. I recall several times when water rationing was necessary and other years when rationing was almost necessary.

I strongly urge the ~~favorable.~~ conclusion to the hearing.

Yours very truly,

Charles R. Bell

Charles R. Bell

CRB: eh

BARNARD, MO., *June 1, 1982.*

Senator JAMES ABDNOR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Being a farmer here in Northwest Missouri I have been very interested in the development of the Creek Watershed project.

When completed this project would control flooding on several thousand acres of land, also it would reduce erosion and be very beneficial on water and soil conservation.

It will also provide an extra large storage capacity of water for the city of Maryville and surrounding towns and the rural areas. We need this Mozingo Creek Watershed so we can develop rural water for the outlying towns and rural areas. We in the rural areas need rural water because the bigger percent of farm water supplies will not pass state inspection tests.

Respectfully yours,

EUGENE J. HENGGELES.

CONCEPTION, MO., *May 26, 1982.*

Senator JAMES ABDNOR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources,
Committee on Environment and Public Works.

DEAR SIR: As a concerned citizen of Nodaway County, Missouri I would highly recommend and appreciate your careful consideration in the upcoming hearing scheduled for June 11, 1982 on the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project. This project will greatly reduce erosion and flood on over 3000 acres of cropland and over 2000 acres of pasture land. It certainly will reduce erosion and sediment deposits on many acres of fertile soil and cropland aside from land benefits, this supply of water is badly needed for both the city of Maryville and the rural communities a great majority of whom are consuming water with a high level of nitrate and other contaminates. This could be eliminated by an adequate source of water supply through the use of rural water districts, which are in progress but are at this time are almost at a standstill for lack of assurance that water will be available.

Respectfully yours,

ERVIN B. AUFFERT,
Treasurer of Nodaway County Water District No. 2.

MARYVILLE, MO.

DEAR JAMES ABDNOR: Please except my letter as a concerned citizen of Maryville, Mo. in support of the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project Hearing. The Mozingo project would be a great asset to the community of Maryville, Mo., as well as to the State of Missouri. Thank you for your time and effort in helping make this project a successful one. God bless you.

Sincerely,

BEN BUCHFIELD.

CONCEPTION SEMINARY COLLEGE,
Conception, Mo., May 29, 1982.

Senator JAMES ABDNOR,
Senate Water Resources Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ABDNOR: I am writing to ask your favorable consideration of the watershed project which is now before your subcommittee. I am sure that you are already familiar with the significant benefits which this project promises to a large segment of Northwest Missouri, both in soil conservation and benefits to farming and in better utilizing the water resources of the area. I wish to call your attention to the widespread public support, both in the city and in rural areas, and to the large area and the many people who will be served by the Mozingo project.

The college seminary of which I am President is located half a county away from Mozingo Creek. Yet the water district within which we are located will, in the not too distint future, depend on Mozingo to serve the towns and the rural population in our area. This year I will be serving as President of the Maryville Rotary Club also and it is abundantly clear to me that the business community of the city is deeply committed to seeing this project through to completion. The fact that a bond issue to provide local funding has already been passed demonstrates the breadth and depth of support. We have put our money where our mouth is!

Nodaway County, in which Mozingo Creek is located, is one of the top ranking agricultural areas of Missouri in both crops and cattle. We have also gradually built up a manufacturing sector to diversify our economic base. Both segments depend on water and on the control of water so that it can be utilized to the economic benefit rather than to the public and private loss of our citizens. For all these reasons I ask that your committee approve the funding of the Mozingo Watershed project.

Yours sincerely,

Rev. **Isaac D. True**, Ph. D.,
President-Rector.

Drs. Imes & Harr, Inc.,
Maryville, Mo., May 28, 1982.

Re Mozingo Creek Watershed project hearing.

James Abdnor,
Chairperson, Water Resources Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Abdnor: I am a physician in Family Practice in Maryville, Missouri. On Friday, June 11, there is to be a Public Hearing before the Senate Water Resources Subcommittee regarding the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project. I feel that this is an important project that will benefit this entire area in many ways. You are probably already aware of the reduced erosion and flooding, as well as the reduction in sediment deposition. In addition, this project will provide approximately twenty-eight times the current water storage capacity for the City of Maryville.

Over and beyond the improvement of flood damage reduction on over 2000 acres, I feel there are some important economic factors involved. Nodaway County, particularly Maryville, is an expanding community. The benefits that will be achieved in the improved water and soil conservation needs will help not only to attract industry, but also physicians to the area. This reservoir would also provide needed recreation facilities. This has been one drawback we have had in terms of attracting physicians, and possibly a factor in attracting industry.

In summary, I support the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project and wish to enter such support into the record with the hope this will become a reality.

Sincerely

Walter E. Dean, M.D.

St. Columba Parish,
Conception Junction, Mo., May 25, 1982.

Senator **James Abdnor**,
Chairman, Committee on Water Resources, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Abdnor: I am writing to you as a private citizen but also as the pastor of a parish of concerned citizens to ask you to support the Mozingo Creek watershed project here in Northwest Missouri.

There are many arguments for this project, and perhaps some valid ones in opposition, but my concern is principally twofold. Actually the main benefit my people will receive from the project is water. There are six towns within the parish and at least two suffer because the people's wells are poisoned by nitrate. They have to haul drinking water in and store it in cisterns. This is true of some of the farm wells too. The Mozingo Project would make it possible for these people to connect to the Maryville water supply, which would be adequate if the Project is approved.

The other concern is with soil conservation. This wide part of the state is subject to erosion as few other parts of the country. The Mozingo Project would in some degree be of assistance with the effort toward conservation too.

I trust you will give some consideration to these remarks and support the Mozingo Watershed Project.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. **Denis Dougherty**, O.S.B.,
Pastor.

MARYVILLE, MO., *June 1, 1982.*

Hon. JAMES ABDNER,
Chairman, Water Resources Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABDNOR: For many years the City of Maryville and surrounding rural area, aided by the Soil Conservation Service, has been trying to obtain Federal Aid in the construction of a very much needed watershed project. A large bond issue was passed by the residents of Maryville for our share of the project, so we are now needing the Federal governments agreement to provide their share, so that the project can get under way.

The rural water district has expanded with the aid of Federal grants, but the water supply is still dependent on our city's reservoir and in a dry summer it is in short supply.

The flood and erosion benefits have been demonstrated many times by the Soil Conservation Service, and last but not least is the economic and recreational values to this whole Northwest Mo. area, which would be tremendous.

I would respectfully urge your much needed assistance in passing this worth-while project.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD FIELDS.

MAYVILLE, MO., *May 26, 1982.*

Senator JAMES ABDNOR,
Water Resources Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ABDNOR: I am writing to urge support for the Mozingo Watershed Project. Our local citzenry has already passed a $4 million bond issue in connection with this project, which shows that we are doing everything we can here to contribute towards it. There is every reason to believe that the help needed from the State will be forthcoming if we secure the Federal aid.

If this project is funded it will assure this area of an adequate water supply, which we do not now have, flood and erosion control, recreation facilities now lacking, and it should attract more industrial development, thereby providing more jobs.

I hope you and your committee will support this project.

Sincerely,

MARY JACKSON.

CONCEPTION JET, MO., MAY 26, 1982.

Senator JAMES ABDNOR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources,
Washington, D.C.

SIR OR SIRS: Concerning the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project, and being an area farmer, I am very much in favor for the furtherance of this undertaking.

Along with many other good reasons, I am more apprehensive about the rural drinking water situation. More and more we hear of water wells becoming unsafe for human consumption.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. KEMPER.

CONCEPTION JET, MO., *May 27, 1981.*

Senator JAMES ABDNOR,
Public Works Chairman,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As an owner, operator of 360 acres of rolling hill cropland, in Nodaway County, I see the great need for soil and Water Conservation.

Our rural water supply is deteriorating in both quantity and quality.

I respectfully ask for your support of the Mozingo Watershed Project.

Sincerely,

DONALD P. MERRIGAN.

Northwest Missouri State University,
Maryville, Mo., June 8, 1982.

Mozingo Creek Watershed Project Hearing,
Water Resources Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Water Resources Subcommittee Members: Because of the high importance of the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project to the Citizens of Nodaway County and a much wider region of Northwest Missouri, I urge your support of the Federal Government's portion of the necessary funding. The citizens of Maryville have already recognized the critical nature of this project and have voted some $4 million in local funds. Missouri state government officials, including Governor Christopher Bond, have indicated the project is a high-priority item for the State's portion of the funding once the Federal portion is in process.

Soil erosion is a blight on this the richest agricultural region in the State of Missouri, and the completion of the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project would do much to reduce this problem. Currently, this area of the state experiences one of the highest erosion rates in the United States. With funding for the project, we would experience a marked reduction in the erosion of thousands of acres of cropland, pasture land and forest land.

In addition, the community of Maryville and Nodaway County would be provided for years with adequate water supplies to support agriculture, a growing industrial base, and a growing Northwest Missouri State University. Without added water supplies, the economic base of the area cannot continue to grow.

As president of Northwest Missouri State University, I speak for the entire University and its governing board in urging your support for the Federal Government's portion of the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project. You will be acting to insure the continued economic and social strength of this vital region of Missouri.

Cordially,

B. D. Owens, *President.*

Maryville, Mo., *May 27, 1982.*

Re Mozingo Creek watershed project, Missouri.

Mr. James Abdnor,
Chairman, Senate Water Resources Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Abdnor: Recent torrential and continued rains in this area graphically point out the reason why Missouri is second in the nation in soil erosion, and why we have the dirtiest rivers.

The need for flood and erosion controls to stop loss of one of our prime resources is very evident. Even though the Mozingo Creek Watershed project is relatively small, its value as a deterrant is large and important.

Rural areas such as ours, struggle to draw businesses and manufacturing plants to our area. Water supply has always been an important factor. The increased water storage capacity would certainly be an asset toward City growth, and for use of our N.W. Missouri State University.

Thank you for being concerned about these problems in our great country.

Yours very truly,

Eva M. Quinn.

Conception, Mo., *May 27, 1982.*

Senator James Abdnor
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Abdnor: This is to show my interest and to ask for your support in the upcoming subcommittee hearing concerning the Mozingo Watershed project.

Being a land owner, I have in the past am still seeing good farm land that is being flooded with uncontrolled waters, also the erosion that is caused by this. I am sure this project would go a long way to help solve some of these problems.

Another interest I have of the many for the Mozingo Watershed is the supply of water it would provide. Living in a rural community our water supply now comes from high nitrate level wells and with the coming of a rural water district we need Mozingo for a water supply.

Thanks for all that you have done and especially for all that you might see fit to do for Mozingo at the upcoming hearing.

JERRY SCHIEBER.

MARYVILLE, MO.

Mr. JAMES ABDNOR,
Water Resources Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABDNOR: The area around Maryville, Missouri rural Nodaway County have a need for more water. We have rural Water District 1, 2 and 3, which goes in all four directions from its main source of water the 102 river which is furnishing water to Maryville. This 4" line goes to nearly all rural farms and they can use water as needed. Since there is so heavy a demand for water the watershed project would eliminate for us the chances of no water or low water ways for this area. This is definitely a big concern and one of the major reasons for the project.

I have 186 hours—a degree in Agriculture from University of Missouri-County Extension Agent and Farm manager for many years. I own an advertising business and 4 miles south of Maryville where the shop is located there is a 4" water line running very close to the buildings. I have for 1.00 lease allowed the Rural Water District A, to locate a small building 7' x 9' with large hose for the farmers to come and get extra water for their needs, this is available 600 gallons of water for 25.00. The need for water is an ever wanted necessity. I hope our area always has the abundance of water so this type of water service can be given to our rural people—farmers of Nodaway County.

The Mosingo project would furnish the N.W. Missouri a water recreational area, besides the conservation flood damages where the area has flood damages and reduce erosion from 3145 acres of cropland to 2,200 acres of pasture to 240 acres of forest land. The protection of flooding of 1,400 acres prime farm land would be benefitted and flood damages would be reduced on another 2,251 acres of flood plain.

The need for water increasing the current water storage capacity by 28 times our present capacity is a very important need for N.W. Missouri.

The public hearings before the Senate Water Resources Subcommittee is Friday, June 11, 1982; so I wish that you continue the support for our community to the Senate Committee.

Sincerely,

NAYRON SINERLY.

MAY 25, 1982.

Subject: Mozingo watershed project.
Senator JAMES ABDNOR.
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ABDNOR: I am a printer living in a small rural town. The unusual heavy rainfall this Spring, make me very aware of the serious loss of farm topsoil. In order to help control this loss we ask your support for the Mozingo Watershed Project.

Our source of household water, where I reside with my mother, is from a shallow well. I am concerned with the drop in the water table in our surrounding area; which causes area residents to use surface water farm ponds. This water, I understood has a high nitrate content.

Your support for this Watershed Project will help to insure our rural area of an approved water supply.

Respectfully yours,

DONALD S. SULLIVAN.

MARYVILLE, MO., *May 28, 1982.*

Hon. JAMES ABDNOR,
Chairman, Water Resources Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.:

I am writing concerning the hearing that thas been set for June 11 by the Water Resources Committee for the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project.

As a citizen of Northwest Missouri I am very interested in seeing this project become a reality.

This project will have far-reaching benefits for our area. I am listing some of the benefits as an example of the effects it will have on us here.

1. This area (Northwest Missouri) has one of the largest soil losses in the nation from erosion. This project would reduce the erosin on approximately 5500 acres in Nodaway County to a tolerable tonnage.

2. Flood damage will be reduced on approximately 2200 acres located in the Mozingo Flood plain.

3. A stable water supply for not only the City of Maryville, but the rural water districts throughout the county would be provided. In our area the nitrate level of the water throughout the area is too high for safe human consumption. This water would replace the high nitrate-level water from local wells.

4. Much could said of the economic impact of a project of this magnitude in our area. With water development there also comes industrial development.

I encourage you to approve this project because of the impact it will have on this area.

Very truly yours,

RUTH S. TILLETT.

WATKINS HARDWARE & APPLICANCES, INC.,
Maryville, Mo., June 4, 1982.

Senator JAMES ABDNOR,
Senate Water Resources Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ABDNOR: First, let me say, "Thank You," for your service on the Water Resource Committee. Your wisdon in chairing this committee certainly shows your interest in the conservation of water & soil in the United States.

Also, we thank you for being accessible by our local citizens in relaying to you the local feelings concerning the Mozingo Watershed. The necessity of conserving water and soil in Northwest Missouri became more critical as rural water districts began to be formed in Nodaway County and as more ground is being plowed up as economic necessity. The Mozingo Creek Watershed was begun several years ago, and realization that the proper location of a dam could accomplish much in soil conservation, provide a large reservoir of water for the City of Maryville, plus provide a lake large enough for recreation put citizens to work to complete Mozingo. The recreation would provide a bonus and have a good economic impact for a farming area already in need of more diverse economic support. The local community has recognized the importance of the Mozingo Creek Watershed and have have already voted a four million dollar revenue bond to guarantee our share of the money.

Indeed, we ask you to take the lead in supporting the Mozingo Watershed Project. Thank you for helping us bring to reality a project of such divorce impact.

Yours sincerely,

LOUIS C. WATKINS, *President.*

CONCEPTION JUNCTION, MO., *May 26, 1982.*

MOZINGO SUBCOMMITTEE: It is my understanding the Subcommittee on Water Resources is to have a hearing on the 11th or 12th of June, 1982. As a farmer, land owner in Nodaway County, I strongly urge your support of the Mozingo Water Project. Presently being proposed in our county of Nodaway in North West Missouri.

Our county is reported to have the second highest soil erosion in the U.S.

Also our water in the rural area is very high in nitrate. We are badly in need of a purified water supply.

I believe proposed Mozingo Water Shed will be of great help in both of these problems.

Thanking you in advance for your support.

I remain,

BERNARD J. WALTER.

MARYVILLE, MO., *May 26, 1982.*

SENATOR JAMES ABDNOR,
Water Resources Subcommittee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABDNOR: It is my understanding that the Mozingo Creek Watershed Project is scheduled for public hearing before the Senate Water Resources Subcommittee on Friday, June 11, 1982.

I very much encourage the Committee to approve this very important project for Northwest Missouri.

Installation of this project will aid and expand the economics of this area of Northwest Missouri. It is certainly a project which has retained the interest of the constituency of this area of Missouri for several years now.

It is my understanding that the accelerated land treatment which would be provided by the Watershed will reduce erosion and flooding on 3,145 acres of cropland, 2,200 acres of pasture land and 240 acres of forest land. Sheet erosion on the upland will be reduced from nine to four tons per acre per year.

Finally, as a resident of the City of Maryville, this project would provide 28 times the current water storage capacity for the City, thereby assuring the capability for city growth and water for rural water districts in this county.

Please convey to the Committee the urgency of approval for this important project.

Yours very truly,

JAMES W. WHAN.

○